

Quasi-local holography and quasi-local mass of classical fields in Minkowski spacetime

László B. Szabados

Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics

H-1525 Budapest 114, P.O.Box 49, Hungary

E-mail: lbszab@rmki.kfki.hu

Dedicated to the memory of Zoltán Perjés (1943-2004), the originator of the relativity research in Hungary.

The 2-surface characterization of special classical radiative Higgs-, Yang–Mills and linear zero-rest-mass fields with any spin is investigated. We determine all the zero quasi-local mass Higgs- and Yang–Mills field configurations with compact semisimple gauge groups, and show that they are plane waves (provided the Higgs field is massless and linear) and appropriate generalizations of plane waves (‘Yang–Mills pp -waves’), respectively. A tensor field (generalizing the energy-momentum tensor for the Maxwell field and of the Bel–Robinson tensor for the linearized gravitational field) is found by means of which the pp -wave nature of the solutions of the linear zero-rest-mass field equations with any spin can be characterized equivalently. It is shown that these radiative Yang–Mills and linear zero-rest-mass fields, given on a finite globally hyperbolic domain D , are determined completely by certain unconstrained data set on a *closed spacelike 2-surface*, the ‘edge of D ’. These pure radiative solutions are shown to determine a dense subset in the set of solutions of various (Yang–Mills and linear zero-rest-mass) field equations. Thus for these fields some ‘classical quasi-local holography’ holds.

1 Introduction

By combining the basic principles of quantum theory and general relativity ‘t Hooft [1] argued that the number of the physical degrees of freedom of a localized system surrounded by a closed 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ should be bounded from above by $C \text{Area}(\mathcal{S})/4L_P^2$, where C is constant of order one and $L_P^2 := \hbar G$, the Planck area. This bound appears to be quite robust, and a similar bound can be derived for the number N of quantum particles in a box bounded by a spherical $\mathcal{S}$ of radius R by requiring that the sum of the zero-point energy of the quantum particles be less than or equal to the Schwarzschild mass $\frac{1}{2G}R$ corresponding to R . Indeed, by the localization of the particles in the box the zero-point energy of one particle is $\hbar\omega = C \frac{\pi\hbar}{R}$ for some constant C of order one, and hence $2\pi^2 C N \leq \text{Area}(\mathcal{S})/4L_P^2$. (This inequality can also be interpreted as an upper bound for the number N of the possible quantum states of a single localized particle with energy not greater than the Schwarzschild mass.) Moreover, combining Bekenstein’s entropy-to-energy bound [2] for weakly gravitating systems, $S/E \leq k\sqrt{\pi \text{Area}(\mathcal{S})}/\hbar$, and the requirement that E should not be greater than the corresponding Schwarzschild mass, Bousso [3] got $S/k \leq \text{Area}(\mathcal{S})/4L_P^2$. (Here k is Boltzmann’s constant.) By the statistical interpretation of the entropy this is essentially the previous inequality. Therefore, the physical degrees of freedom in a domain of the 3-space grow with the *area* of the boundary of the domain, rather than with its volume. This observation lead ‘t Hooft to the so-called holographic hypothesis [1]: The physical state of a system bounded by $\mathcal{S}$ must be possible to be characterized by degrees of freedom on $\mathcal{S}$ with information density not greater than one bit per Planck area.

Susskind [4] implemented this principle mathematically by assuming the existence of a map from the 3-space to the 2-surface using light rays arriving orthogonally at $\mathcal{S}$, the so-called ‘screen’. However, the space in general relativity is a spacelike hypersurface Σ , and if the screen is its boundary, $\mathcal{S} := \partial\Sigma$, then Σ may

be mapped by null geodesics to the *world tube* of $\mathcal{S}$, which is a timelike submanifold, but certainly not to the screen itself. Nevertheless, in a spacetime admitting a preferred timelike vector field (e.g. a hypersurface orthogonal timelike Killing field) the null geodesics can be projected to Σ , and these could be used to define the map $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. Corley and Jacobson refined this idea of Susskind, and they clarified the global properties of such maps [5]. The recent formulations of the holographic principle (and of the covariant entropy bounds) are also based on this view [3,6].

Here we suggest another mathematical formulation of the holographic principle. The overall picture is based on that we preferred in looking at the various quasi-local energy-momentum expressions [7]: $\mathcal{S}$ is the common boundary of all the spacelike hypersurfaces that are Cauchy surfaces for the domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$ of Σ . Thus, $\mathcal{S}$ can be considered as being associated with $D(\Sigma)$ rather than only to an individual Cauchy surface: $\mathcal{S}$ is the ‘edge’ of $D(\Sigma)$. Then, according to the holographic principle, the state of the matter+gravity system on the *four dimensional* $D(\Sigma)$ should be able to be characterized by appropriate data on the *two dimensional* screen $\mathcal{S}$. This formulation of the holographic hypothesis is, in some sense, causally complement to the previous ones [3-6] based on the use of null geodesics. Indeed, by $I^\pm[\mathcal{S}] \cap D(\Sigma) = \emptyset$ and $\partial I^\pm[\mathcal{S}] \cap \text{int } D(\Sigma) = \emptyset$ the screen $\mathcal{S}$ is causally disjoint from the interior of $D(\Sigma)$. This would be a field theoretical formulation of the principle, using certain ‘elementary solutions’ of the field equations on $D(\Sigma)$ to ‘scan’ the space Σ , in contrast to the previous, basically (general relativistic) geometric optical approach.

The motivation of this picture came from the results of the investigations of the Dougan–Mason quasi-local energy-momentum and mass [8]: The energy-momentum, associated with a spacelike 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ with spherical topology, is vanishing iff $D(\Sigma)$ is flat; and the energy-momentum is null (i.e. the mass is zero) iff $D(\Sigma)$ has a *pp*-wave geometry and the matter is pure radiation [9,10]. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that in the latter case the geometry (and also the matter fields in the form of linear massless scalar or Maxwell fields) on $D(\Sigma)$ are completely determined by the spinor geometry of (and, in the presence of matter fields, by an additional complex function on) $\mathcal{S}$ [11]. Thus the state of the special radiative gravitational field inside $\mathcal{S}$, specified by the vanishing of a basic quasi-local observable, the mass, can be fully characterized by an appropriate data set on $\mathcal{S}$.

The aim of the present paper is to investigate the validity of the present formulation of the holographic principle for certain classical matter fields in Minkowski spacetime. In particular, we discuss the connection between the following three concepts:

1. The quasi-local mass of the matter fields, associated with a closed spacelike 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ in Minkowski spacetime,
2. The pure radiative solutions of specific matter field equations (Higgs, Yang–Mills, linear zero-rest-mass fields with any spin) on the globally hyperbolic domain $D(\Sigma)$ for which the common boundary of the Cauchy surfaces Σ is just $\mathcal{S}$,
3. The complete characterization of these radiative solutions in terms of data specified on the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ rather than the familiar Cauchy data on Σ .

Since the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ will be assumed to be a topological 2-sphere (i.e. the ‘screen’ is finite, two dimensional, and it is at finite distance from the physical system), the holography that we study here will be called ‘classical quasi-local holography’. We show that the vanishing of the quasi-local mass is equivalent to the pure radiative nature of the matter fields, these special radiative solutions can be characterized by data sets on the screen, and that they determine a dense subset in the space of regular matter fields. Thus, ironically enough, while the holographic hypothesis came from the combination of the basic principles of the gravitational and quantum physics, some form of the holographic hypothesis could be shown to work at the classical level in the absence of gravitation. Though the results depend on the flatness of spacetime, many of them can be generalized for curved spacetimes e.g. by considering the Dougan–Mason quasi-local mass of the matter+gravity system in Section 3. (Indeed, the Dougan–Mason energy-momentum is based on

the 2-surface integral of the Nester-Witten 2-form, the 3-surface integral of whose exterior derivative could be written as the sum of the energy-momentum for the matter fields [via Einstein's equations] and of the so-called Sparling 3-form. The latter can be interpreted as the energy-momentum of the gravitational 'field' itself.) On the other hand, it is not quite clear how all the results can be generalized. Nevertheless, we hope that the present investigations could be instructive for an analysis in more general spacetimes.

In the second section we recall some facts about the geometry of closed spacelike 2-surfaces, compact spacelike hypersurfaces with boundary, and the 'finite' globally hyperbolic domains. The role of this section is to fix the notations and present the geometric background to make the present paper essentially self-contained. Next, in Section 3, we briefly recall the notion of quasi-local mass for general matter fields and study its properties. First we show that the quasi-local mass is zero precisely when the matter fields on $D(\Sigma)$ are of pure radiative in the sense that $T_{ab}L^b = 0$ for some *constant* null vector field L^a on $D(\Sigma)$, provided T_{ab} satisfies the dominant energy condition. Then we consider special matter fields. According to the standard model the basic building blocks of Nature are the fermions and the gauge fields, represented by genuine spinor and (non-Abelian) Yang-Mills fields, respectively, and by an additional scalar field, called the Higgs field. Thus we determine all the solutions of the Higgs and Yang-Mills field equations (with any compact semisimple gauge groups) for which the quasi-local mass is zero. These are all plane waves (provided the Higgs field is massless and linear, i.e. non-self-interacting) and appropriate generalizations of plane waves ('Yang-Mills *pp*-waves'), respectively.

Since the spinor fields in general do not satisfy the dominant energy condition, the general results above cannot be applied to characterize the spinor *pp*-waves by the vanishing of the quasi-local mass. However, a totally symmetric, trace-free tensor field $T_{a_1 \dots a_{2s}}$ is found, which is a natural generalization of the energy-momentum tensor of the Maxwell field and of the Bel-Robinson tensor for the linearized gravitational field, by means of which the *pp*-wave character of the solutions of the linear zero-rest-mass field equations with spin s on $D(\Sigma)$ can be characterized equivalently. All these solutions are represented by a constant spinor field O^A and a complex function $\phi(u, \zeta)$ on $D(\Sigma)$, where O^A is the spinor constituent of the null wave vector $L^a = O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ (and hence we call it the 'wave spinor') and $\phi(u, \zeta)$ is C^2 in the coordinate u , labeling the wave-fronts, and complex analytic in ζ , the anti-holomorphic coordinate in the intersection of the wave-fronts and Σ . These results are presented in Section 4.

In Section 5 we determine those data sets on $\mathcal{S}$ by means of which the *pp*-waves on $D(\Sigma)$ can be fully characterized: Provided a convexity condition for the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ is satisfied, it is shown that a pair (O^A, ϕ) on $D(\Sigma)$ is completely determined by a constant spinor field O^A on the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ and two real valued functions $(f(u, w), g(u))$ of two and one variables, respectively, where w is a coordinate on the intersection of $\mathcal{S}$ and the wave-fronts. The data set $(O^A, f(u, w), g(u))$ on $\mathcal{S}$ is unconstrained, and the field ϕ at any point $p \in D(\Sigma)$ is expressed as an appropriate contour integral on $\mathcal{S}$. Finally, we show that the *pp*-wave solutions of the Weyl equation with a given, fixed wave spinor O^A form so large a space $\Phi(O^A)$ that any spinor field (with arbitrary spin s) on Σ can be uniformly approximated with arbitrary accuracy by the elements of the tensor product $\Phi(O^A) \otimes \bar{\Phi}(O^A)$, where $\bar{\Phi}(O^A)$ is the complex conjugate of $\Phi(O^A)$. Therefore, this tensor product is a dense subspace in the space of all continuous spinor fields. The consequences of this result are also discussed. The Stone-Weierstrass theorem that we use in the proof is stated in the Appendix.

Throughout this paper the abstract index formalism of [12] will be used, and only the underlined and boldface indices take numerical values. The signature of the spacetime metric is -2 , and we use units in which the speed of light is $c = 1$.

2 Finite Cauchy developments with constant null vector field

Although in the present paper primarily we are interested in the quasi-local characterization of fields in Minkowski spacetime, in the present section we do not restrict our attention to flat spacetimes. It is enough to be only a pp -wave spacetime, and, for later use, in the subsequent discussion we assume only this.

- The geometry of closed spacelike 2-surfaces

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a closed, orientable spacelike 2-surface in M . Let t^a and v^a be a future pointing timelike and an outward directed spacelike unit normal of $\mathcal{S}$, respectively, such that $t^a v_a = 0$. Then $\Pi_b^a := \delta_b^a - t^a t_b + v^a v_b$ is the orthogonal projection to $\mathcal{S}$ and $q_{ab} := \Pi_a^c \Pi_b^d g_{cd}$ is the induced metric on $\mathcal{S}$. Then the corresponding induced area 2-form is $\varepsilon_{cd} := t^a v^b \varepsilon_{abcd}$. The extrinsic curvatures corresponding to the normals t^a and v^a are defined, respectively, by $\tau_{ab} := \Pi_a^c \Pi_b^d \nabla_c t_d$ and $\nu_{ab} := \Pi_a^c \Pi_b^d \nabla_c v_d$. The expansion tensor of the standard outgoing and ingoing null normals $l^a := t^a + v^a$ and $n^a := \frac{1}{2}(t^a - v^a)$, respectively, are $\theta_{ab} = \tau_{ab} + \nu_{ab}$ and $\theta'_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_{ab} - \nu_{ab})$. Then the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ will be called convex [13,11] if $\mathcal{S}$ is homeomorphic to S^2 and the outgoing null normals are expanding ($q^{ab}\theta_{ab} > 0$), the ingoing null normals are contracting ($q^{ab}\theta'_{ab} < 0$) and, in addition, $2 \det \|\theta^a_b\| = (\theta_{ab}\theta_{cd} - \theta_{ac}\theta_{bd})q^{ab}q^{cd} > 0$ and $2 \det \|\theta'^a_b\| = (\theta'_{ab}\theta'_{cd} - \theta'_{ac}\theta'_{bd})q^{ab}q^{cd} > 0$ also hold. Note that because of the scaling freedom $l^a \mapsto \alpha l^a$, $n^a \mapsto \alpha^{-1} n^a$ the normals l^a and n^a (or t^a and v^a) are not uniquely determined by $\mathcal{S}$, and the expansion tensors θ_{ab} and θ'_{ab} depend on the choice for the normals l^a and n^a , the convexity of $\mathcal{S}$ is well defined.

If L^a is any nowhere vanishing null vector field on $\mathcal{S}$, then $z_a := \Pi_a^b L_b$ is vanishing at a point of $\mathcal{S}$ precisely when L^a is orthogonal to $\mathcal{S}$. If L_a is constant on $\mathcal{S}$ in the sense that $\Pi_a^c \nabla_c L_b = 0$, then by the definitions we have $\delta_a z_b = \nu_{ab} v^c L_c - \tau_{ab} t^c L_c$, where δ_a is the intrinsic Levi-Civita derivative operator on $(\mathcal{S}, q_{ab})$. This implies that $\delta_{[a} z_{b]} = 0$, i.e. z_a is a closed 1-form on $\mathcal{S}$. If $\mathcal{S}$ is homeomorphic to S^2 , then by $H^1(S^2) = 0$ it follows the existence of a smooth function $u : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $z_a = \delta_a u$. Clearly, $s^a := \varepsilon^{ab} z_b$ is a vector field tangent to the $u = \text{const}$ level sets of $\mathcal{S}$.

- The geometry of compact spacelike hypersurfaces with boundary

Let Σ be a smooth, compact orientable spacelike hypersurface with smooth 2-boundary $\mathcal{S}$. Let t^a be the future pointing unit timelike normal of Σ , and $P_b^a := \delta_b^a - t^a t_b$, the orthogonal projection to Σ . Then the induced metric is $h_{ab} := P_a^c P_b^d g_{cd}$ and the extrinsic curvature of Σ in M is defined by $\chi_{ab} := P_a^c P_b^d \nabla_c t_d$ (and hence on its boundary $\tau_{ab} = \Pi_a^c \Pi_b^d \chi_{cd}$ holds). If L^a is any nowhere zero null vector field, then since Σ is spacelike, $Z^a := P_b^a L^b$ is nowhere vanishing on Σ . Hence it can be decomposed as $L^a = Z^a + \|Z\| t^a$, where $\|Z\|^2 := -h_{ab} Z^a Z^b$ is the (everywhere positive) norm of Z^a . If L^a is null and constant on Σ in the sense that $P_a^b \nabla_b L^c = 0$, then $D_a Z_b = -\|Z\| \chi_{ab}$, where D_a is the intrinsic Levi-Civita derivative operator on Σ . This implies that $D_{[a} Z_{b]} = 0$, and hence $Z_a = D_a u$ for some (in general only *locally* defined) function u on Σ . If, in addition, L^a is constant in the spacetime in the sense that $\nabla_b L^a = 0$, then $L_a = \nabla_a u$ for some real valued function u . We assume that the domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$ is contained in the domain of this function u , and hence u on Σ is globally defined. Since Z_a is nowhere vanishing, u defines a foliation of Σ by its level surfaces $S_u := \{p \in \Sigma | u(p) = u\}$. These are smooth spacelike 2-surfaces. The induced Riemannian metric determines a unique complex structure on the surfaces S_u ; i.e. they are Riemann surfaces.

Let $\{E_1^a, E_2^a, E_3^a\}$ be an orthonormal frame field on Σ such that $E_3^a := \frac{1}{\|Z\|} Z^a$, i.e. $L^a = \|Z\|(t^a + E_3^a)$. Then E_3^a is globally well defined on Σ , and the (locally defined) complex null vectors $\sqrt{2}M^a := E_1^a - iE_2^a$ and $\bar{M}^a$ are (1,0) and (0,1) type vectors in the complex structure of the Riemann surfaces S_u , respectively. The vectors L^a , M^a and $\bar{M}^a$ can be completed to be a Newman–Penrose complex null tetrad on Σ by introducing the future pointing null vector field N^a such that N^a be orthogonal to the 2-surfaces S_u and normalized according to $L^a N_a = 1$. Explicitly, it is given by $2\|Z\|N^a = t^a - E_3^a$. The lapse function of the foliation $\{S_u\}$ of Σ is just $\|Z\|^{-1}$. Thus the ‘acceleration’ of $\{S_u\}$ in Σ is $E_3^a D_a E_{3b} = (\delta_b^a + \|Z\|^{-2} Z^a Z_b) \|Z\| D_a (\frac{1}{\|Z\|})$, while its extrinsic curvature in Σ is ${}^u k_{ab} := (\delta_a^e + E_3^e E_{3a})(\delta_b^f + E_3^f E_{3b}) D_e (-E_{3f}) = (\delta_a^e + E_3^e E_{3a})(\delta_b^f + E_3^f E_{3b}) \chi_{ef}$. (It is $-E_3^a$ along that u is *increasing*, thus it seems natural to choose $-E_3^a$ to be the normal of S_u in Σ .) Then

by the Gauss equation the integrability condition of $L^a L_a = 0$, $\nabla_a L_b = 0$ implies that the scalar curvature ${}^u R$ of the surfaces S_u is zero; i.e. S_u are locally flat Riemann geometries.

Without further restrictions the topology of the Riemann surfaces may be very complicated. If, however, $\mathcal{S}$ is convex in the sense above, then by Proposition 4.6 of [11]

- i. Σ is homeomorphic to the closed three-ball B^3 ;
- ii. each Riemann surface S_u is homeomorphic to $\mathbf{R}^2$; and
- iii. each S_u intersects the 2-boundary $\mathcal{S}$ in a single smooth closed curve $\gamma_u := \mathcal{S} \cap S_u$, u has a single minimum p_- and a maximum point p_+ on $\mathcal{S}$, and hence $\{z^a, s^a\}$ on $\mathcal{S} - \{p_+, p_-\}$ can be normalized with respect to q_{ab} (or to g_{ab}) to form an orthonormal dyad.

This proposition implies that the Riemann surfaces S_u are connected, simply connected subsets of a flat plane, and globally defined complex coordinates $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ can be introduced on one of the leaves, e.g. on S_0 , which can be extended to the other leaves (e.g. by $X^a D_a \zeta = 0$ for some vector field X^a on Σ which is transversal to the leaves) to obtain a coordinate system $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ on Σ . These coordinates are not unique: By appropriate coordinate transformation $M^a = (\partial/\partial \bar{\zeta})^a$ can be achieved. Hence, in particular, M^a and $\bar{M}^a$ are globally well defined on S_u and their Lie bracket is zero. Thus ζ is the *anti*-holomorphic coordinate on the Riemann surfaces S_u . The complex coordinates $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ are still not unique: The remaining allowed transformation of them is $\zeta = \exp(ia(u))\zeta' + A(u)$ for real $a(u)$ and complex $A(u)$. In the rest of the present paper we will assume that these convexity conditions are satisfied.

- The geometry of the domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$

Obviously the previous constructions can be repeated on the leaves Σ_t of a foliation of $\text{int } D(\Sigma)$. If α is the lapse of this foliation, i.e. $\alpha t^a \nabla_a t = 1$, then the acceleration of Σ_t is $a_b := t^a \nabla_a t_b = -D_b(\ln \alpha)$. Since Σ is compact with boundary, each of the leaves Σ_t of the foliation of $D(\Sigma)$ has the same 2-boundary: $\partial \Sigma_t = \mathcal{S}$. Thus, in particular, the lapse α is vanishing and the acceleration a_e is diverging on $\mathcal{S}$. The general time derivative (of tensor fields) is defined as the projected Lie derivative along a vector field ξ^a for which $\xi^a \nabla_a t = 1$. Such a ξ^a necessarily has the form $\xi^a = \alpha t^a + \beta^a$ ('evolution vector field'), where $\beta^a = P_b^a \beta^b$. Clearly, then the 1-parameter family of transformations generated by such a ξ^a preserves the globally hyperbolic domain $D(\Sigma)$ precisely when β^b , the shift vector, is tangent to $\mathcal{S}$ on $\mathcal{S}$. The 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ can be interpreted as the edge of the globally hyperbolic domain $D(\Sigma)$.

Since L^a is null it has the form $O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ for some spinor field O^A , and if L^a is constant then there exists a phase $\exp(i\psi)$ for which $\exp(i\psi)O^A$ is also constant. Thus we can (and will) assume that the spinor constituent O^A of the constant null L^a is constant.

Using the single, fixed hypersurface Σ and the constant null vector field L^a one can introduce another coordinate system on $\text{int } D(\Sigma)$ in a natural way. Since the $u = \text{const}$ hypersurfaces are null, the integral curves of L^a are geodesics. Let r be the affine parameter along these geodesics measured from Σ . Then any $p \in \text{int } D(\Sigma)$ sits on a uniquely determined integral curve of L^a which intersects Σ at a well defined point q . Then we label p by the coordinates $(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ if the affine distance of p from q is r and the coordinates of q on Σ are $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.

Analogously, the Newman–Penrose complex null tetrad $\{L^a, N^a, M^a, \bar{M}^a\}$ introduced on the single hypersurface Σ can be extended to a tetrad field on the whole $D(\Sigma)$ by Lie propagating the vectors N^a and M^a along the integral curves of L^a . Since, however, L^a is constant, this propagation implies that $L^e \nabla_e N^a = [L, N]^a = 0$ and $L^e \nabla_e M^a = [L, M]^a = 0$, furthermore $[M, \bar{M}]^a = 0$ still holds. Clearly, L^a , M^a and $\bar{M}^a$ are coordinate vectors: $L^a = (\partial/\partial r)^a$, $M^a = (\partial/\partial \bar{\zeta})^a$ and $\bar{M}^a = (\partial/\partial \zeta)^a$, but in general $N^a = (\partial/\partial u)^a - (H + G\bar{G})(\partial/\partial r)^a + \bar{G}(\partial/\partial \zeta)^a + G(\partial/\partial \bar{\zeta})^a$ for some real and complex functions $H = H(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ and $G = G(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, respectively. Then the metric of $D(\Sigma)$ in these coordinates takes the form $ds^2 = 2du dr - 2d\zeta d\bar{\zeta} + 2(G d\zeta + \bar{G} d\bar{\zeta}) du + 2H du^2$. By an appropriate allowed transformation of the coordinates

$(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ the function G can be ensured to satisfy $(\partial G/\partial \bar{\zeta}) = (\partial \bar{G}/\partial \zeta)$, whenever the constant spinor field O^A can be completed by another spinor I^A such that $O_A I^A = 1$, $N^a = I^A \bar{I}^{A'}$ and $O^A \bar{I}^{A'} = M^a$ hold (see [11]). The remaining allowed transformations of the complex coordinates are $\zeta = \exp(ia)\zeta' + A(u)$ for some real constant a and complex function $A(u)$. The spinor field I^A can be given explicitly as $I^A = \|Z\|^{-1} t^{AA'} \bar{O}_{A'}$, and, conversely, $O^A = -2\|Z\| t^{AA'} \bar{I}_{A'}$. This spin frame is uniquely determined and constant along the integral curves of L^a , i.e. $L^a \nabla_a O_B = L^a \nabla_a I_B = 0$.

As an illustration consider the standard Cartesian coordinate system (t, x, y, z) in Minkowski spacetime, let Σ be the ball of radius R in the $t = 0$ hyperplane and $\mathcal{S}$ its boundary, a 2-sphere of radius R , which is clearly convex. $L_a := \nabla_a u$, $u := t - z$, is constant and null, and the Riemann surfaces S_u in Σ are the $z = \text{const}$ 2-planes, in which $\zeta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x - iy)$ are the complex anti-holomorphic coordinates. The boundary γ_u of the Riemann surface S_u is a circle in the 2-plane orthogonal to the z -axis with radius $\sqrt{R^2 - u^2}$. The affine parameter along the integral curves of L^a , measured from Σ , is $r = t$. In these coordinates the spacetime metric takes the form $ds^2 = 2du dr - 2d\zeta d\bar{\zeta} - du^2$.

3 Zero quasi-local mass configurations of matter fields

3.1 Zero quasi-local energy-momentum and zero quasi-local mass configurations

Let Σ be any smooth, compact spacelike hypersurface with smooth boundary $\mathcal{S} := \partial\Sigma$. Then for any vector field K^a we can form the integral $\mathbb{Q}_\Sigma[K^a] := \int_\Sigma K_a T^{ab} t_b d\Sigma$, where t^a is the future pointing unit timelike normal to Σ and $d\Sigma := \frac{1}{3!} t^e \varepsilon_{eabc}$ is the induced volume element 3-form on Σ . (Here ε_{abcd} is the spacetime volume 4-form.) In general $\mathbb{Q}_\Sigma[K^a]$ depends on Σ , but if K^a is a Killing vector of the spacetime, then it depends only on the homology class of Σ modulo its boundary $\mathcal{S}$: If Σ' is another smooth compact spacelike hypersurface with the same boundary $\mathcal{S}$, then $\mathbb{Q}_\Sigma[K^a]$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{\Sigma'}[K^a]$, defined on Σ and Σ' , coincide. Hence the integral depends only on $\mathcal{S}$ and can be denoted by $\mathbb{Q}_\mathcal{S}[K^a]$. In fact, $\mathbb{Q}_\mathcal{S}[K^a]$ can be rewritten as the 2-surface integral of some ‘superpotential 2-form’ $\frac{1}{2} \cup [K^a]_{ab}$ on $\mathcal{S}$, where $K_e T^{ef} \varepsilon_{fabc} = 3\nabla_{[a} \cup [K^e]_{bc}]$.

Thus suppose that M is the Minkowski spacetime, fix a Cartesian coordinate system $\{x^{\underline{a}}\}$, $\underline{a} = 0, \dots, 3$, and write the general Killing 1-form as $K_a = T_{\underline{a}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{a}} + M_{\underline{a}\underline{b}}(x^{\underline{a}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{b}} - x^{\underline{b}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{a}})$ for some constant coefficients $T_{\underline{a}}$ and $M_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} = -M_{\underline{b}\underline{a}}$. Being $\mathbb{Q}_\mathcal{S}[K^e]$ linear in K_a , it has the structure $\mathbb{Q}_\mathcal{S}[K^e] = T_{\underline{a}} \mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}} + M_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} \mathbb{J}^{\underline{a}\underline{b}}$, and the coefficients of $T_{\underline{a}}$ and $M_{\underline{a}\underline{b}}$ define the quasi-local energy-momentum $\mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}}$ and angular momentum $\mathbb{J}^{\underline{a}\underline{b}}$ of the matter fields, respectively, associated with the closed spacelike 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$. In fact, $\mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}}$ and $\mathbb{J}^{\underline{a}\underline{b}}$ are elements of the dual space of the space of the translation and boost-rotation Killing vectors of the Minkowski spacetime, respectively, and under the Poincaré transformations of the Cartesian coordinates, $x^{\underline{a}} \mapsto x^{\underline{b}} \Lambda_{\underline{b}}^{\underline{a}} + C^{\underline{a}}$, they transform just in the expected way. (For a more detailed discussion see [7].)

Next suppose that the energy-momentum tensor satisfies the dominant energy condition: $T^{ab}V_b$ is future pointing and non-spacelike for any future pointing and non-spacelike vector V^a , and clarify the positivity properties of the energy-momentum. Then $\mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}}$ is *future pointing and non-spacelike* with respect to the natural Lorentz metric $\eta_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} := \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$ on the space of translations, i.e. both the quasi-local mass $\mathfrak{m}$, defined by $\mathfrak{m}^2 := \mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}} \mathbb{P}^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{a}\underline{b}}$, and the quasi-local energy $\mathbb{P}^0$ are non-negative. If $\mathbb{P}^0 = 0$, then by the dominant energy condition the energy-momentum tensor must be vanishing on every spacelike hypersurface Σ with the fixed 2-boundary $\mathcal{S}$, implying the vanishing of the whole energy-momentum vector $\mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}}$ as well. Thus *the quasi-local energy-momentum $\mathbb{P}^{\underline{a}}$ is vanishing if and only if the energy-momentum tensor of the matter fields is vanishing on the whole domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$ of Σ with the given 2-boundary $\mathcal{S}$.*

Similarly, let us consider the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the matter fields. If $\mathfrak{m} = 0$, then let $L_a := \mathbb{P}_{\underline{a}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{a}}$, which is a constant null 1-form field on M ; and if $\mathbb{P}^0$ is positive, then L^a is future pointing. Then

$$0 = \mathfrak{m}^2 := \mathbf{P}^{\underline{a}} \mathbf{P}^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} = \int_{\Sigma} L_a T^{ab} t_b d\Sigma. \quad (3.1.1)$$

Since by the dominant energy condition the integrand on the right is non-negative, this implies that $L_a T^{ab} = 0$. Therefore, the energy-momentum tensor has a constant null eigenvector with zero eigenvalue, i.e. its algebraic type is pure radiation. Hence, again by the dominant energy condition, it has the form $T^{ab} = \tau L^a L^b$ for some non-negative function τ on M . This implies that $\mathbf{P}^{\underline{a}} = e L^{\underline{a}}$ and $\mathbf{J}^{\underline{a}\underline{b}} = L^{\underline{a}} e^{\underline{b}} - L^{\underline{b}} e^{\underline{a}}$, where $e := \int_{\Sigma} \tau L^a t_a d\Sigma$ and $e^{\underline{a}} := \int_{\Sigma} \tau x^{\underline{a}} L^a t_a d\Sigma$. Conversely, if T^{ab} is of pure radiation with constant null eigenvector L^a with zero eigenvalue, then obviously $\mathbf{P}^{\underline{a}}$ is null, and hence $\mathfrak{m} = 0$. Therefore, *the quasi-local mass $\mathfrak{m}$ is vanishing if and only if the energy-momentum tensor of the matter fields is of pure radiation with constant null eigenvector $L_a = \mathbf{P}_{\underline{a}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{a}}$ on the whole domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$.*

In the next three subsections we discuss the consequences of these general results for specific matter fields. In particular, we determine the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the Higgs and Yang–Mills fields, which turn out to be special radiative solutions of the field equations.

3.2 Zero quasi-local mass configurations of the Higgs fields

Let $\phi^{\mathbf{i}}$, $\mathbf{i} = 1, \dots, n$, be finite number of real scalar fields, $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ a symmetric constant $n \times n$ matrix, $V(\phi)$ an algebraic function of the fields, and consider the Lagrangian density $L_H := \frac{1}{2} G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} g^{ab} \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} \nabla_b \phi^{\mathbf{j}} - V(\phi)$. The multiplet $\phi^{\mathbf{i}}$ of fields subject to the dynamics governed by this Lagrangian is called a Higgs field. (The fields $\phi^{\mathbf{i}}$ can be considered as the components of a section in some frame field of a real vector bundle $H(M)$ of rank n over M associated with a principal G -bundle. But then they can be globally defined only if the frame field is globally defined, i.e. when $H(M)$ is globally trivializable. However, the section of $H(M)$ that $\{\phi^{\mathbf{i}}\}$ represents can be globally defined and the whole analysis can be carried out even if $H(M)$ is not globally trivializable. In that case the small boldface Latin indices can be considered as abstract indices referring to the fiber space and $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ as a fiber metric, but its components can be chosen to be constant only on the domain of the trivializations of $H(M)$. In the presence of a gauge field $A_{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{i}}$, coupled minimally to the Higgs field, the spacetime covariant derivative $\nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}}$ is replaced by the spacetime *and* gauge-covariant derivative $\nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} + e A_{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{i}} \phi^{\mathbf{k}}$ for some coupling constant e . The complex Higgs fields are considered as pairs of real ones. In particular, for a single *complex* scalar field $\varphi = \phi^1 + i\phi^2$ the metric $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} = \delta_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$, $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} = 1, 2$, gives the familiar real scalar product $\varphi \bar{\varphi}$.) The corresponding field equations are $G_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{i}} \nabla_a \nabla^a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} + 2(\partial V / \partial \phi^{\mathbf{j}}) = 0$. The symmetric energy-momentum tensor is $T_{ab} = G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} (\nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}}) (\nabla_b \phi^{\mathbf{j}}) - \frac{1}{2} g_{ab} g^{cd} G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} (\nabla_c \phi^{\mathbf{i}}) (\nabla_d \phi^{\mathbf{j}}) + g_{ab} V(\phi)$. For the sake of concreteness we assume that the ‘potential term’ $V(\phi)$ has the form $V = \frac{1}{2} m^2 G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} \phi^{\mathbf{i}} \phi^{\mathbf{j}} + \frac{1}{4} \lambda (G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} \phi^{\mathbf{i}} \phi^{\mathbf{j}})^2$, i.e. the fields are of rest-mass m and if $\lambda \neq 0$ then they are self-interacting.

The energy-momentum tensor with this potential satisfies the dominant energy condition precisely when $\lambda \geq 0$ and $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ is positive semi-definite, and then $T_{ab} = 0$ is equivalent to $\phi^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$ provided $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ is positive definite. (In contrast to quantum gauge theoretical investigations, in the present paper we assume that m is real, and hence $m^2 \geq 0$. The positive definiteness of $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ is equivalent to that the actual representation of the gauge group G is homomorphic to a subgroup of the *compact* $O(n)$.) Next suppose that $T_{ab} L^b = 0$ for some null vector field L^a . Then, if $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ is positive definite, $T_{ab} L^a L^b = 0$ implies that $L^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$. Completing L^a to a Newman–Penrose complex null tetrad $\{L^a, N^a, M^a, \bar{M}^a\}$ as e.g. in Section 2, this implies $\nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = f^{\mathbf{i}} L_a + g^{\mathbf{i}} M_a + \bar{g}^{\mathbf{i}} \bar{M}_a$ for some real valued field $f^{\mathbf{i}}$ and complex $g^{\mathbf{i}}$. Substituting $L^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$ back to $T_{ab} L^b = 0$ we obtain that $2V(\phi) = G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} \nabla^a \phi^{\mathbf{j}} = -2G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} g^{\mathbf{i}} \bar{g}^{\mathbf{j}}$. Since its left hand side is non-negative and the right hand side is non-positive, this implies that $g^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$, and if at least one of m and λ is non-zero then $\phi^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$. Therefore, *for positive definite $G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}$ non-trivial, zero quasi-local mass configurations exist only for zero-rest-mass, non-self-interacting Higgs fields.* In this case $\nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = f^{\mathbf{i}} L_a$ and $T_{ab} = G_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} f^{\mathbf{i}} f^{\mathbf{j}} L_a L_b$, and *the zero quasi-local mass configurations are precisely those fields $\phi^{\mathbf{i}}$ that are constant in the directions L^a, M^a and*

$\bar{M}^a$: $L^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$ and $M^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = \bar{M}^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$. Thus the energy-momentum tensor of the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the Higgs field is the sum of the energy-momentum tensor of the decoupled, individual components of $\phi^{\mathbf{i}}$ for each $\mathbf{i}$. The directional derivatives of $f^{\mathbf{i}} = N^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}}$ are $L^a \nabla_a f^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$ and $M^a \nabla_a f^{\mathbf{i}} = [M, N]^a \nabla_a \phi^{\mathbf{i}} + N^a \nabla_a (M^b \nabla_b \phi^{\mathbf{i}}) = [M, N]^a (L_a N^b + N_a L^b - M_a \bar{M}^b - \bar{M}_a M^b) \nabla_b \phi^{\mathbf{i}} = [M, N]^a L_a f^{\mathbf{i}} = 0$. Thus in the coordinate system $(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ of Section 2 this means that $\phi^{\mathbf{i}} = \phi^{\mathbf{i}}(u)$ and $f^{\mathbf{i}} = f^{\mathbf{i}}(u)$. In particular, if φ is a zero-rest-mass *complex* scalar field with zero quasi-local mass, then $\nabla_a \varphi = f L_a$ for some *complex* f , and $L^a \nabla_a \varphi = M^a \nabla_a \varphi = \bar{M}^a \nabla_a \varphi = 0$ and $T_{ab} = f \bar{f} L_a L_b$ hold.

3.3 Zero quasi-local mass configurations of the Yang–Mills fields

Let the Yang–Mills field be represented on a real vector bundle $F(M)$ of rank N , associated with a principal G -bundle, in a fixed frame field by the familiar connection 1-forms (or gauge potentials) $A_{a\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}$ and the corresponding curvature 2-forms (or field strengths) $F_{\mathbf{L}cd}^{\mathbf{K}} := \nabla_c A_{d\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}} - \nabla_d A_{c\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}} + A_{c\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} A_{d\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{M}} - A_{d\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} A_{c\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{M}}$. Thus the indices $\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{L}, \dots = 1, \dots, N$ are referring to a fixed (maybe only locally defined) frame field in $F(M)$, and $A_{a\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}$ and $F_{\mathbf{L}ab}^{\mathbf{K}}$ are 1 and 2-forms, respectively. They take their value in the matrix Lie algebra representing the Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$ of the gauge group G , by means of which representation the vector bundle $F(M)$ was associated with the principal G -bundle. The dynamics of the Yang–Mills fields is governed by the Lagrangian $L_{YM} := -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mathbf{L}cd}^{\mathbf{K}} F_{\mathbf{K}cd}^{\mathbf{L}}$. The corresponding field equations are $\nabla_b F_{\mathbf{L}ab}^{\mathbf{K}} + A_{b\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} F_{\mathbf{L}ab}^{\mathbf{M}} - F_{\mathbf{M}ab}^{\mathbf{K}} A_{b\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{M}} = 0$, and the symmetric energy-momentum tensor is $T_{ab} = -(F_{\mathbf{L}ca}^{\mathbf{K}} F_{\mathbf{K}b}^{\mathbf{L}} - \frac{1}{4} g_{ab} F_{\mathbf{L}cd}^{\mathbf{K}} F_{\mathbf{K}cd}^{\mathbf{L}})$. If $\{e_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}\}$, $\alpha, \beta, \dots = 1, \dots, \dim \mathcal{G}$, is a fixed basis of the Lie algebra in the given representation, then we can write $F_{\mathbf{L}ab}^{\mathbf{K}} =: e_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}} F_{ab}^{\alpha}$ and $A_{a\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}} =: e_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}} A_a^{\alpha}$, and the real 2-forms F_{ab}^{α} can be represented by the symmetric spinors $\phi_{AB}^{\alpha} = \phi_{(AB)}^{\alpha}$ defined by $F_{ab}^{\alpha} = \varepsilon_{A'B'} \phi_{AB}^{\alpha} + \varepsilon_{AB} \bar{\phi}_{A'B'}^{\alpha}$. (Of course, there is absolutely no connection between the spacetime spinor indices $A, B, \dots$ and the *boldface* bundle indices $\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{L}, \dots$.) Defining the structure constants $c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha}$ of the Lie algebra of the gauge group by $e_{\beta\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} e_{\gamma\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{M}} - e_{\gamma\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} e_{\beta\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{M}} =: c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha} e_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}$, the Bianchi identities and the Yang–Mills field equations can be rewritten as $\varepsilon^{CD} (\nabla_{CA'} \phi_{DA}^{\alpha} + c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha} A_{CA'}^{\beta} \phi_{DA}^{\gamma}) = 0$. It might be interesting to note that the expression between the parentheses is just the spacetime and gauge covariant derivative of ϕ_{AB}^{α} , where the latter is defined on the vector bundle based on the adjoint representation of the gauge group. The energy-momentum tensor of the Yang–Mills fields takes the form $T_{ab} = 2G_{\alpha\beta} \phi_{AB}^{\alpha} \bar{\phi}_{A'B'}^{\beta}$, where we introduced the notation $G_{\alpha\beta} := e_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}} e_{\beta\mathbf{K}}^{\mathbf{L}} = G_{(\alpha\beta)}$. In particular, if the representation of the gauge group on which the definition of the vector bundle $F(M)$ is based is the adjoint representation, then the frame field $e_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}$ can be chosen to be the structure constants $c_{\alpha\beta}^{\gamma}$, and the metric $G_{\alpha\beta}$ will be the familiar Cartan–Killing metric on the Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$. This metric is well known to be positive definite precisely for compact semisimple Lie groups.

The energy-momentum tensor satisfies the dominant energy condition if $G_{\alpha\beta}$ is positive semi-definite, and in this case $T_{ab} = 0$ is equivalent to the flatness of the connection $A_{a\mathbf{L}}^{\mathbf{K}}$ provided $G_{\alpha\beta}$ is positive definite. Next suppose that $L^a = O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ is an eigenvector of T_{ab} with zero eigenvalue. If $G_{\alpha\beta}$ is positive definite then this implies that $\phi_{AB}^{\alpha} O^B = 0$, and hence that $\phi_{AB}^{\alpha} = \phi^{\alpha} O_A O_B$ for some complex functions ϕ^{α} . Then by the results of subsection 3.1, $O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ is constant, and hence O^A can be (and, in fact, will be) chosen to be constant. Thus, in particular, the algebraic type of the spinors ϕ_{AB}^{α} is N (see subsection 4.1 below) and $T_{ab} = 2G_{\alpha\beta} \phi^{\alpha} \bar{\phi}^{\beta} L_a L_b$. Substituting this form of ϕ_{AB}^{α} into the field equations we find $O^A (\nabla_{AA'} \phi^{\alpha} + c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha} A_{AA'}^{\beta} \phi^{\gamma}) = 0$, i.e.

$$L^a \nabla_a \phi^{\alpha} = c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha} \phi^{\beta} A_a^{\gamma} L^a, \quad (3.3.1a)$$

$$M^a \nabla_a \phi^{\alpha} = c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha} \phi^{\beta} A_a^{\gamma} M^a. \quad (3.3.1b)$$

To solve these equations we should use the expression of the curvature F^{α}_{ab} in terms of the gauge potential A^{α}_a . However, to simplify the calculations, it seems reasonable to use the maximal, allowed gauge fixing.

Let $\Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}}$ be a gauge transformation in $F(M)$, i.e. a function on M taking its value in the matrix Lie group representing the gauge group. Then under the action of this gauge transformation the gauge potential is well known to transform according to $A^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{L}} \mapsto \bar{A}^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{L}} := \Lambda_{\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} A^{\mathbf{M}}_{a\mathbf{N}} \Lambda^{\mathbf{N}}_{\mathbf{L}} + \Lambda_{\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{K}} (\nabla_a \Lambda^{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{L}})$, where $\Lambda_{\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{N}}$ is defined by $\Lambda^{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{R}} \Lambda^{\mathbf{N}}_{\mathbf{M}} = \delta^{\mathbf{N}}_{\mathbf{R}}$. We want to use this freedom to make as many components of the gauge potential zero as it is possible. Thus suppose that X^a and Y^a are vector fields on M whose contraction with the transformed gauge potential are vanishing, $X^a \bar{A}^{\mathbf{R}}_{aS} = Y^a \bar{A}^{\mathbf{R}}_{aS} = 0$, and clarify the conditions of the existence of such gauge transformations. Then by the transformation formula these conditions take the form

$$X^a \nabla_a \Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}} = -X^a A^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{M}} \Lambda^{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{L}}, \quad Y^a \nabla_a \Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}} = -Y^a A^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{M}} \Lambda^{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{L}}. \quad (3.3.2)$$

This is a system of partial differential equations for $\Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}}$, and it is a direct calculation to check that its integrability condition is

$$F^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}ab} X^a Y^b = -\left(A^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{M}} \Lambda^{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{L}} + \nabla_a \Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}}\right) [X, Y]^a. \quad (3.3.3)$$

Thus, if X^a and Y^a form an involutive distribution, this is equivalent to $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}ab} X^a Y^b = 0$.

Next let us fix a spacelike hypersurface Σ and a complex null tetrad $\{L^a, N^a, M^a, \bar{M}^a\}$ which is adapted to the foliation of Σ by S_u and Lie propagated along the integral curves of L^a , as in the last point of Section 2. Then the result that the anti-self-dual part of the field strength has the structure $\phi^{\alpha}_{AB} = \phi^{\alpha} O_A O_B$ is equivalent to

$$F^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}ab} L^a M^b = 0, \quad F^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}ab} M^a \bar{M}^b = 0, \quad (3.3.4a)$$

$$F^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}ab} L^a N^b = 0, \quad F^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}ab} N^a \bar{M}^b = -\phi^{\alpha} e^{\mathbf{K}}_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}. \quad (3.3.4b)$$

Since for the vectors of the null tetrad $[L, M]^a = [M, \bar{M}]^a = 0$ holds, by (3.3.3) and (3.3.4a) we can impose the gauge conditions $M^a A^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{L}} = L^a A^{\mathbf{K}}_{a\mathbf{L}} = 0$. Then (3.3.4b) reduces to $L^a \nabla_a (N^b A^{\mathbf{K}}_{b\mathbf{L}}) = 0$ and $\bar{M}^a \nabla_a (N^b A^{\mathbf{K}}_{b\mathbf{L}}) = -\phi^{\alpha} e^{\mathbf{K}}_{\alpha\mathbf{L}}$; while the field equations (3.3.1a) and (3.3.1b) reduce to the *linear* equations

$$L^a \nabla_a \phi^{\alpha} = 0, \quad M^a \nabla_a \phi^{\alpha} = 0. \quad (3.3.5)$$

Thus the functions ϕ^{α} are constant in the directions L^a and M^a , i.e. in particular, they are anti-holomorphic on the Riemann surfaces S_u . Then, however, it is straightforward to write down the general solution of (3.3.4b)-(3.3.5) for the gauge potentials too. It is gauge equivalent to the gauge potential given by

$$L^a A^{\alpha}_a = M^a A^{\alpha}_a = 0, \quad (3.3.6a)$$

$$N^a A^{\alpha}_a = \Phi^{\alpha}(u, \zeta) + \bar{\Phi}^{\alpha}(u, \bar{\zeta}), \quad (3.3.6b)$$

where $\Phi^{\alpha}(u, \zeta)$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, \dim \mathcal{G}$, are arbitrary complex valued functions being smooth (in fact C^2 is enough) in u and complex analytic in ζ . Essentially this Φ^{α} is a complex primitive function of the only independent component of the corresponding field strength: $\phi^{\alpha}(u, \zeta) = -(\partial \Phi^{\alpha}(u, \zeta) / \partial \zeta)$. The gauge potential A^{α}_a satisfies the Lorenz gauge condition $\nabla^a A^{\alpha}_a = 0$, and the transformations preserving the gauge conditions (3.3.6a) are of the form $\Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}} = \Lambda^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{L}}(u)$. We call (3.3.6) a *pp*-wave solution of the Yang-Mills equations, though these solutions, discovered by Coleman [14], are known as ‘non-Abelian plane waves’. Indeed, these are genuine generalizations of the familiar plane wave solutions: For the latter the functions ϕ^{α} are bounded

in the whole Minkowski spacetime, and hence are independent of ζ . However, quasi-locally ϕ^α may be any anti-holomorphic function. Therefore, *the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the Yang–Mills equations with positive definite metric $G_{\alpha\beta}$ are the pp -waves (3.3.6), and, conversely, any pp -wave configuration has zero quasi-local mass.* The energy-momentum tensor for the pp -wave solutions is the sum of the energy-momentum tensors of the components of the gauge fields for each α . The expression (3.3.6) provides an exact solution of the Yang–Mills field equations for arbitrary gauge group (i.e. even if the metric $G_{\alpha\beta}$ is *not* positive definite) even on a curved background spacetime admitting L^a as a constant null vector field, but in these more general cases the solution (3.3.6) cannot be characterized as *the* zero quasi-local mass configurations: The quasi-local mass is zero for the pp -wave solutions, but there might be other solutions too giving zero quasi-local mass. The solution (3.3.6) is completely analogous to the pp -wave solutions of general relativity, which are known to be precisely the zero Dougan–Mason quasi-local mass configurations [10,11]. This result for the *non-Abelian* Yang–Mills fields gives further support to the claim [7] that any reasonable quasi-local energy-momentum expression in general relativity should be such that the zero-mass configurations be precisely the pp -waves.

In the analogous representation of the electromagnetic field by the symmetric spinor ϕ_{AB} , defined as the anti-self-dual part of the field strength by $F_{ab} = \varepsilon_{A'B'}\phi_{AB} + \varepsilon_{AB}\bar{\phi}_{A'B'}$, the energy-momentum tensor is $T_{ab} = 2\phi_{AB}\bar{\phi}_{A'B'}$, while the source-free Maxwell equations take the form $\nabla_{A'}^A\phi_{AB} = 0$. This T_{ab} satisfies the dominant energy condition, and hence for the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the electromagnetic field one has $\phi_{AB} = \phi O_A O_B$ for some constant spinor field O_A . Then the Maxwell equations yield $O^A\nabla_{AA'}\phi = 0$. Therefore, if I^A is another (not necessarily constant) spinor field on M for which $O_A I^A = 1$ and $\{L^a, N^a, M^a, \bar{M}^a\}$ is the corresponding Newman–Penrose complex null tetrad, then ϕ is constant in the directions L^a and M^a .

The zero quasi-local mass configuration of the minimally coupled Yang–Mills–Higgs fields, formulated on the Whitney sum $H(M) \oplus F(M)$ of the vector bundles above with the Lagrangian $L_H + L_{YM}$, can be treated analogously. These configurations are again pp -wave like solutions of the coupled Yang–Mills–Higgs field equations with a common (constant, null) wave vector L^a of the Higgs and Yang–Mills fields.

Finally, it could perhaps be worth noting that the overall picture remains the same for the coupled Einstein–Yang–Mills system. In fact, the general analysis of [9,10] can be completed by the analysis above to show that, under the conditions given there, the Dougan–Mason quasi-local mass is vanishing if and only if the geometry of $D(\Sigma)$ is given by the pp -wave solutions of the Einstein–Yang–Mills equations found by Güven [15].

3.4 On the zero quasi-local mass configurations of spinor fields

The Lagrangian of the Weyl spinor field ϕ^A is $L_W = \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\phi}^{A'}\nabla_{AA'}\phi^A - \phi^A\nabla_{AA'}\bar{\phi}^{A'})$, and the corresponding field equation and energy-momentum tensor, respectively, is $\nabla_{A'}^A\phi^A = 0$ and $T_{ab} = \frac{i}{4}(\bar{\phi}_{A'}\nabla_{BB'}\phi_A - \phi_A\nabla_{BB'}\bar{\phi}_{A'} + \bar{\phi}_{B'}\nabla_{AA'}\phi_B - \phi_B\nabla_{AA'}\bar{\phi}_{B'})$. Clearly, for the solutions of the form $\phi^A = \phi O^A$ for some *constant* spinor field O^A the energy-momentum tensor has $L^a = O^A\bar{O}^{A'}$ as a null eigenvector with zero eigenvalue, and hence the corresponding quasi-local mass is zero. In this case $O^A\nabla_{AA'}\phi = 0$, and hence $L^a\nabla_a\phi = 0$ and $M^a\nabla_a\phi = 0$, i.e. $\phi = \phi(u, \zeta)$. However, since this energy-momentum tensor does *not* satisfy even the weak energy condition, the vanishing of the quasi-local mass for the Weyl neutrino field does not imply $T_{ab}L^a = 0$ for some null L^a , and that the zero quasi-local mass configurations would necessarily be some wave-type solutions.

Similarly, the energy-momentum tensor for the zero-rest-mass (or simply z.r.m.) spinor fields with index structure $\phi_{A_1\dots A_{m+1}}^{B'_1\dots B'_m} = \phi_{(A_1\dots A_{m+1})}^{(B'_1\dots B'_m)}$, $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $2s = 2m + 1$, does not satisfy the weak energy condition (see [16]). Non-zero rest mass for the spinor fields does not improve the positivity properties of the energy-momentum tensor: For the Dirac spinor Ψ^α , represented by the pair $(\phi^A, \bar{\psi}^{A'})$ of Weyl spinors,

the energy-momentum tensor is the sum of the energy-momentum tensors for the constituent spinors ϕ^A and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}$ above, independently of the rest-mass parameter in the Lagrangian for Ψ^α .

Since the energy-momentum tensor for other higher (i.e. $s \geq \frac{3}{2}$) spin fields (e.g. with the index structure $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \phi_{(A_1 \dots A_{2s})}$, including the Weyl spinor ϕ_{ABCD} for the linearized gravity [12]) cannot even be defined, their special ‘pure radiative configurations’ does not seem to be connected with a special value of some quasi-local observable, e.g. with the vanishing of the quasi-local mass. Nevertheless, as we will see in the next section, their pure radiative modes can in fact be characterized quasi-locally just in an analogous way.

4 Linear zero-rest-mass fields with any spin

4.1 Generalities

We learnt in the previous section that the vanishing of the quasi-local mass is equivalent to special radiative solutions of the z.r.m. scalar and Yang–Mills field equations, whenever the field equations became *linear*. As we will see, these are special *linear zero-rest-mass* field equations. A particularly interesting special case of the linear z.r.m. field equations is the field equations for the gravitational perturbations of the Minkowski spacetime. These motivate us to consider these equations in general rather than only e.g. Weyl spinors, the classical representatives of fermionic matter.

If $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$, $2s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, is a completely symmetric spinor field, then let $\alpha_A, \beta_A, \dots, \zeta_A$ be the principal spinors of $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$, i.e. for which $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \alpha_{(A_1} \beta_{A_2} \dots \zeta_{A_{2s})}$ holds (see e.g. [12, 17]). If all these principal spinors coincide, then $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is called null or of type N, and hence it has the structure $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \alpha_{A_1} \dots \alpha_{A_{2s}}$. The linear z.r.m. field equation for any $2s \in \mathbf{N}$ is $\nabla_{A'}^A \phi_{AA_2 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$, which in Minkowski spacetime implies the wave equation $\nabla_{BB'} \nabla^{BB'} \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$. By linear z.r.m. field equation for $s = 0$ one usually means the wave equation, the field equation that we got in subsection 3.2. for the Higgs field in the special case $m = \lambda = 0$.

If Σ is a spacelike hypersurface with normal t^a , then the unitary spinor form of the differential operator $P_a^b \nabla_b$, acting on the unprimed spinor fields defined on Σ , is well known [18] to be $\mathcal{D}_{AB} := \sqrt{2} t^{A'} ({}_A \nabla_{B'})_{A'}$. Then the 3+1 form of the linear z.r.m. field equations for non-zero spin takes the form

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} t^e \nabla_e \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} + \mathcal{D}_{B(A_1} \phi^B_{A_2 \dots A_{2s})} = 0, \quad (4.1.1)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{BC} \phi^{BC}_{A_3 \dots A_{2s}} = 0. \quad (4.1.2)$$

The first expresses the time derivative of the spinor field in terms of its spatial derivative, while the second is a restriction on the spinor field on the spacelike hypersurface. Thus, foliating $D(\Sigma)$ by smooth spacelike Cauchy surfaces Σ_t with normal t^a and lapse α , and multiplying both sides of (4.1.1) by α , we find that it is the evolution equation in $D(\Sigma)$ along the special ‘evolution vector field’ αt^a ; and (4.1.2) is a constraint. Hence the Weyl spinor field ($s = \frac{1}{2}$) is unconstrained, but for $s \geq 1$ equation (4.1.2) gives $2s - 1$ restrictions on the $2s + 1$ components of the spinor field, yielding two complex unconstrained degrees of freedom at each point of Σ . In particular, for the Maxwell field the familiar electric and magnetic field strengths are given by $E_a + iB_a = 2\varepsilon_{A'B'} \phi_{AB} t^{B'}$, thus by $D_a(E^a + iB^a) = 2t^{BB'} (\nabla_{B'}^A \phi_{AB}) = \sqrt{2} \mathcal{D}_{AB} \phi^{AB}$ the constraint (4.1.2) is nothing but the conditions that the field strengths be divergence free, and hence the unconstrained degrees of freedom are the two components of such E^a s and the two components of such B^a s. (For a *complex* scalar field ϕ satisfying the wave equation the freely specifiable initial data on Σ consists of ϕ and $t^a \nabla_a \phi$, thus we have two complex degrees of freedom at each point of Σ for $s = 0$ too.)

Let $C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1 \dots A_{2s})})$ denote the infinite dimensional complex vector space of the smooth totally symmetric spinor fields with indices $2s$ on Σ , and, for any $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}, \psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \in C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1 \dots A_{2s})})$, define the Hermitian scalar product

$$\langle \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}, \psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \rangle_s := \int_{\Sigma} \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \bar{\psi}_{A'_1 \dots A'_{2s}} 2^s t^{A_1 A'_1} \dots t^{A_{2s} A'_{2s}} d\Sigma. \quad (4.1.3)$$

Clearly, this is positive definite and let Γ_s denote the metric completion of $C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1 \dots A_{2s})})$ in the corresponding L_2 -norm $\|\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}\|^2 := \langle \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}, \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \rangle_s$. Thus Γ_s is a Hilbert space. The differential operator $\mathcal{D} : C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1 \dots A_{2s})}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1 \dots A_{2s-2})}) : \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \mapsto \mathcal{D}^{BC} \phi_{BC A_1 \dots A_{2s-2}}$ is a linear, underdetermined elliptic operator, and the closure of the space of the solutions of (4.1.2), $\hat{\Gamma}_s := \overline{\ker \mathcal{D}}$, can be interpreted as the ‘constraint surface’ in Γ_s . It might be interesting to note that the formal adjoint of $\mathcal{D}$ is just the complex conjugate 3-surface twistor operator.

4.2 pp-wave and plane wave solutions

The significance of type N solutions is that they are thought of as purely radiative configurations. In the present section, however, we consider only a special subclass of null fields, especially since the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the Yang–Mills fields belong to this.

Thus suppose that $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is not only null, but also a *pp*-wave as well in the sense that its $2s$ -fold principal spinor is proportional to a *constant* spinor O^A , i.e. $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \phi O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$. (For the Yang–Mills field this structure of the anti-self-dual curvature ϕ_{AB}^α for some *constant* O_A also was a consequence of $\mathfrak{m} = 0$.) Note that the *pp*-wave solutions can exist precisely when the spacetime geometry is also a *pp*-wave, i.e. admits a constant null vector field, e.g. in Minkowski spacetime. (Indeed, if (M, g_{ab}) admits a constant spinor field O^A , then $L^a := O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ is a constant null vector field, and, conversely, if $O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ is constant, then there exists a phase $\exp(i\psi)$ for which $\exp(i\psi) O^A$ is constant. If (M, g_{ab}) admits *two independent pp*-waves [in the sense that the two constant spinors are not proportional to each other], then (M, g_{ab}) is flat.) Then the field equations yield that $O^A \nabla_{AA'} \phi = 0$, which, in the Newman–Penrose complex null frame considered in Section 2, gives $L^a \nabla_a \phi = 0$ and $M^a D_a \phi = 0$. These are precisely the field equations (3.3.5) for the quasi-local mass configurations of the Yang–Mills fields in a special gauge. Therefore, in the coordinates introduced at the end of Section 2, we have that ϕ is independent of the coordinates r and $\bar{\zeta}$ (i.e. in particular it is anti-holomorphic on the Riemann surfaces S_u), and hence $\phi = \phi(u, \zeta)$. Substituting $\phi O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$ into (4.1.2) we find that, for *pp*-waves, (4.1.2) is equivalent to $M^a \nabla_a \phi = 0$, but (4.1.1) is to both $M^a \nabla_a \phi = 0$ and $L^a \nabla_a \phi = 0$. In particular, for the Maxwell field (and for the components of the Yang–Mills fields for each value of the index α) $E^a + iB^a = -2\phi \|Z\| M^a$, implying that $E_a E^a = B_a B^a$, $E_a B^a = 0$, $(E_a + iB_a) Z^a = 0$, the well known characteristic properties of the null Maxwell fields, and that $E_a E^a + B_a B^a = -4|\phi|^2 \|Z\|^2$.

As we saw in subsection 3.2, in the zero quasi-local mass configurations of the (real or complex) massless *scalar* fields the field variable ϕ was not only anti-holomorphic, but constant on the $u = \text{const}$ ‘wave fronts’. Thus it is natural to consider this special case too. We call the *pp*-wave solution $\phi O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$ a plane wave if ϕ is constant on the ‘wave-fronts’, i.e. when $\phi = \phi(u)$. The familiar Fourier modes in Minkowski spacetime, indexed by the future pointing constant null vector field L^a , have the form $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}(L, x) := \Phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}(L) \exp(-iL_{\underline{a}} x^{\underline{a}})$. Here $\Phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}(L)$ is a constant spinor depending on L^a , $x^{\underline{a}}$ are the Cartesian coordinates and $L_{\underline{a}}$ are the components of L_a in the Cartesian basis: $L_a = L_{\underline{a}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{a}}$. This is a solution of the linear z.r.m. field equations precisely when $L^{A'} \Phi_{AA_2 \dots A_{2s}}(L) = 0$, and, if we write $L^{AA'} = O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$, then $\Phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}(L) = c(L^e) O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$ for some constant $c(L^e)$. Furthermore, in the coordinates $(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ adapted to a *constant* complex null tetrad $\{L^a, N^a, M^a, \bar{M}^a\}$ one has $\exp(-iL_{\underline{a}} x^{\underline{a}}) = \exp(-iu)$, i.e. the Fourier mode $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}(L, x)$ is a special plane wave.

4.3 pp-wave spinor fields and quasi-local observables

Although we do not have any energy-momentum tensor for a general spinor field, on a given spacelike hypersurface Σ we can define the ‘strength’ of the fields by the integral of their pointwise positive definite Hermitian norm that we used to define the L_2 scalar product (4.1.3) above. This norm motivates us to introduce, for totally symmetric unprimed spinor fields, the tensor field $T_{a_1 \dots a_{2s}} := 2^s \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \bar{\phi}_{A'_1 \dots A'_{2s}}$, $2s \in \mathbf{N}$. This is totally symmetric and trace free, and if $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is a solution of the linear z.r.m. field equation then it is divergence-free. For $s = 1$ it coincides with the *physical* energy-momentum tensor for the Maxwell field above, and for $s = 2$ with the Bel–Robinson (or, according to the convention of [12], four times the Bel–Robinson) tensor for the linearized Weyl tensor of the weak gravitational field. Furthermore, it satisfies an analog of the dominant energy condition: The proof of the analogous statement for the energy-momentum tensor of the Maxwell field given in [12] can be applied directly to $T_{a_1 \dots a_{2s}}$. Indeed, since any future pointing nonspacelike vector is a sum of two future pointing null vectors, it is enough to prove that $T^a_{a_2 \dots a_{2s}} X_2^{a_2} \dots X_{2s}^{a_{2s}}$ is future pointing and non-spacelike only for future pointing *null* vectors $X_2^a, \dots, X_{2s}^a$. Thus let $X_i^a = \xi_i^A \bar{\xi}_i^{A'}$, $i = 2, \dots, 2s$. Then $T^a_{a_2 \dots a_{2s}} X_2^{a_2} \dots X_{2s}^{a_{2s}} = 2^s (\phi^A_{A_2 \dots A_{2s}} \xi_2^{A_2} \dots \xi_{2s}^{A_{2s}}) (\bar{\phi}^{A'}_{A'_2 \dots A'_{2s}} \bar{\xi}_2^{A'_2} \dots \bar{\xi}_{2s}^{A'_{2s}})$, which is future pointing and null. Hence for any vector field K^a it is natural to define the quasi-local norm of the totally symmetric spinor fields *with respect to* K^a on Σ as the flux integral of the current $K^a t^{a_2} \dots t^{a_{2s-1}} T_{aa_2 \dots a_{2s-1}}^e$ on Σ :

$$\mathbf{N}_\Sigma[K^a] := \int_\Sigma K^a T_{aa_2 \dots a_{2s}} t^{a_2} \dots t^{a_{2s}} d\Sigma. \quad (4.3.1)$$

Clearly, for $K^a = t^a$ this reduces to the L_2 norm $\|\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}\|^2$. In contrast to $\mathbf{Q}_S[K^a]$ of subsection 3.1, in general it depends not only on $\partial\Sigma$ but on Σ as well (i.e. not ‘conserved’), even for a Killing vector K^a . Obviously, $\mathbf{N}_\Sigma[K^a]$ is non-negative for any future pointing non-spacelike K^a .

In spite of the fact that $\mathbf{N}_\Sigma[K^a]$ is not conserved, it can be used to characterize the identically vanishing and the *pp*-wave spinor fields on the globally hyperbolic domain $D(\Sigma)$:

Theorem 4.3.2:

The linear z.r.m. field $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is vanishing on $D(\Sigma)$ if and only if $\mathbf{N}_{\Sigma_0}[K^a] = 0$ for some (and hence for every) future pointing *timelike* K^a on some (and hence on every) Cauchy surface Σ_0 for $D(\Sigma)$. In particular, $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$ on $D(\Sigma)$ iff $\|\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}\| = 0$ on Σ .

Proof:

If $\mathbf{N}_{\Sigma_0}[K^a] = 0$ for some future pointing *timelike* K^a , then, since $T^a_{a_2 \dots a_{2s}} t^{a_2} \dots t^{a_{2s}}$ is future pointing and non-spacelike, by (4.3.1) $T_{aa_2 \dots a_{2s}} t^{a_2} \dots t^{a_{2s}} = 0$ must hold. But then, contracting with t^a , we obtain that $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$ on Σ_0 . However, foliating the domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$ of Σ by a family Σ_t of Cauchy surfaces such that e.g. $\Sigma = \Sigma_0$, by (4.1.1) this implies that $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$ on the whole $D(\Sigma)$. To see this it is enough to recall that any C^2 solution $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ of the linear z.r.m. field equation solves the wave equation, for which a well posed initial value problem can be formulated. However, its solution is causal in the sense that the vanishing of the field and its first time derivative on the initial hypersurface Σ implies the vanishing of the field on the whole $D(\Sigma)$. But by (4.1.1) the vanishing of $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ on Σ implies the vanishing of $t^e \nabla_e \phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ as well, and hence $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$ on $D(\Sigma)$. (For a more detailed discussion of the initial value problem for the wave equation see e.g. [19].) The proof in the other direction is trivial. $\square$

Theorem 4.3.3:

The linear z.r.m. field $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is a *pp*-wave on $D(\Sigma)$ if and only if $\mathbf{N}_{\Sigma_0}[L^a] = 0$ for some future pointing constant null L^a on some (and hence on any) Cauchy surface Σ_0 in $D(\Sigma)$.

Proof:

Suppose that $N_{\Sigma_0}[L^a] = 0$ for some future pointing non-spacelike L^a on Σ_0 , but $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is not identically zero on $D(\Sigma)$. Then, since both L^a and $T^a_{a_2 \dots a_{2s}} t^{a_2} \dots t^{a_{2s}}$ are future pointing and non-spacelike, by (4.3.1) they must be null and proportional to each other. Thus let $L^a = O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$. Then

$$0 = L^a T_{aa_2 \dots a_{2s}} t^{a_2} \dots t^{a_{2s}} = 2^s (O^A \phi_{AA_2 \dots A_{2s}}) (\bar{O}^{A'} \bar{\phi}_{A' A'_2 \dots A'_{2s}}) t^{A_2 A'_2} \dots t^{A_{2s} A'_{2s}}. \quad (4.3.4)$$

This implies that $O^A \phi_{AA_2 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$ on Σ_0 . Hence $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is null and O^A is (proportional to) its $2s$ -fold principal spinor on Σ_0 . Thus it has the form $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \phi O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$ for some complex function ϕ . Since by our assumption O^A is constant on Σ_0 , $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is a *pp*-wave on Σ_0 . Next we show that it is a *pp*-wave on the whole $D(\Sigma)$ as well. Let us extend O^A from Σ_0 to $D(\Sigma)$ as a constant spinor field, denoted also by O^A , and let the corresponding null vector field on $D(\Sigma)$ be denoted also by L^a . Obviously, this extension is unique. Finally, let us extend the complex function ϕ from Σ_0 to $D(\Sigma)$ to be constant along the integral curves of L^a , i.e. by $L^a \nabla_a \phi = 0$, and define $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \phi O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$. This solves the linear z.r.m. field equations on $D(\Sigma)$ if $M^a \nabla_a \phi = 0$ as well. Thus we should show that this solution is unique, and hence that $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ on $D(\Sigma)$ is a *pp*-wave. Since, however, every solution of the linear z.r.m. field equations is a solution of the wave equation on $D(\Sigma)$ as well, and the solution of the initial value problem for the wave equation on a globally hyperbolic domain is unique, the uniqueness of the solution $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = \phi O_{A_1} \dots O_{A_{2s}}$ follows.

Conversely, if $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ is null with $2s$ -fold principal spinor α^A , in particular if it is a *pp*-wave, then obviously $N_{\Sigma_0}[\alpha^A \bar{\alpha}^{A'}] = 0$ on any Cauchy surface Σ_0 for $D(\Sigma)$. $\square$

If $N_\Sigma[K^a] = 0$ for two independent future pointing and nonspacelike vector fields K_1^a and K_2^a on Σ , then $K_1^a + K_2^a$ is timelike and $N_\Sigma[K_1^a + K_2^a] = 0$, and hence by Theorem 4.3.2 $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} = 0$ on $D(\Sigma)$. In Minkowski spacetime the space of the constant spacetime vector fields on the spacelike hypersurface Σ is isomorphic to the Lorentzian vector space of the translation Killing fields: The restriction to Σ of a translation Killing field is constant on Σ , and, conversely, every such constant vector field is the restriction to Σ of some uniquely determined translation. Therefore, restricting the vector field K^a in the argument of $N_\Sigma[K^a]$ to be a *constant* vector field on Σ , K_a has the form $T_{\underline{a}} \nabla_a x^{\underline{a}}$ for some constants $T_{\underline{a}}$ and the Cartesian coordinates $x^{\underline{a}}$ in M . Consequently, (4.3.1) takes the form $N_\Sigma[K^a] = N_\Sigma^{\underline{a}} T_{\underline{a}}$. The coefficient $N_\Sigma^{\underline{a}}$, being an element of the dual of the space of the constant spacetime vector fields on Σ , can be interpreted as some form of the quasi-local energy-momentum, and we call it the ‘norm-energy-momentum’. Its length with respect to the Lorentzian metric on the space of the constant vector fields, $\eta_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} N_\Sigma^{\underline{a}} N_\Sigma^{\underline{b}}$, might be called the ‘norm-mass’. Indeed, by theorems 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 the role that they play in the characterization of the special z.r.m. configurations on $D(\Sigma)$ is analogous to that of the physical quasi-local energy-momentum and mass. In particular, for *pp*-wave configurations with non-zero spin, characterized by (O^A, ϕ) on Σ , the quasi-local norm-energy-momentum takes the form

$$N_\Sigma^{\underline{a}} = L^{\underline{a}} 2^s \int_\Sigma |\phi|^2 \|Z\|^{2s-1} d\Sigma, \quad (4.3.5)$$

where $L^{\underline{a}}$ are the components of $L^a = O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ in the Cartesian coordinate system. Interestingly enough, $Q_S[K^a]$, built from the *physical* energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field, can also be recovered from (4.3.5) for $s = 0$ provided the $\phi \mapsto f\|Z\|$ substitution is made, where the function f measures the gradient of ϕ : It is given by $\nabla_a \phi = f L_a$.

On the other hand, in general $N_\Sigma^{\underline{a}}$ depends on Σ (i.e. ‘non-conserved’) and its physical dimension is different from that of energy-momentum. In particular, for the gravitational perturbations described by a spin-two field ϕ_{ABCD} , the spinor form of the linearized Weyl tensor of the weak gravitational field, the

‘norm-energy-density’ $T_{abcd}t^at^bt^ct^d$ has dimension cm^{-4} , and hence there are no powers A and B for which $G^Ac^B T_{abcd}t^at^bt^ct^d$ would have the correct dimension $g\,cm^{-1}sec^{-2}$ of the energy density in the traditional units. (Here c is the speed of light in vacuum.)

Clearly, the norm (4.1.3) and the tensor field $T_{a_1\dots a_{2s}}$ can be defined for any spinor field $\phi_{A_1\dots A_k B'_1\dots B'_l}$ for which $k+l=2s$. Then, however, $T_{a_1\dots a_{2s}}$ does not share the desirable properties that we have for totally symmetric purely primed or unprimed spinor fields. Another, potentially interesting generalization $N_\Sigma[K_1^a, \dots, K_k^a]$ of the norm may be introduced using a given collection $K_1^a, \dots, K_k^a$, $k \leq (2s-1)$, of vector fields as the integral of $K_1^{a_1} \dots K_k^{a_k} T_{a_1\dots a_k b_{k+1}\dots b_{2s}} t^{b_{k+1}} \dots t^{b_{2s}}$. A remarkable property of this expression for $k=2s-1$, $s \geq 1$, is that it is conserved if $K_1^a, \dots, K_k^a$ are conformal Killing fields.

5 Two-surface characterization of classical fields

5.1 The holographic data for the pp-waves

Since the function $\phi = \phi(u, \zeta)$ in the *pp*-wave solutions of the linear z.r.m. field equations with any spin was complex analytic in the variable ζ , any *pp*-wave solution on Σ , and hence on the whole domain of dependence $D(\Sigma)$ too, is completely determined by the constant spinor field O^A and the value φ of ϕ on $\mathcal{S}$, i.e. by the pair (O^A, φ) . The aim of the present subsection is to clarify whether or not such a pair can be characterized in terms of structures and objects defined *only* on the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$, and to determine the independent unconstrained 2-surface data on $\mathcal{S}$ corresponding to a *pp*-wave on $D(\Sigma)$. We call such a data set the *holographic data* for the *pp*-wave.

Let us discuss first the spinor field O^A . The restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ of the constant spinor fields of the Minkowski spacetime can be recovered as the *constant spinor fields on $\mathcal{S}$* , where λ_A is called constant on $\mathcal{S}$ if $\Pi_c^b \nabla_b \lambda_A = 0$. In fact, in a general spacetime there are no constant spinor fields on $\mathcal{S}$, but in Minkowski spacetime the space of the constant spinor fields is two complex dimensional and inherits a natural symplectic metric. Thus they form an $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ spin space $(\mathbf{S}_0^A, \varepsilon_{AB})$. Since the restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ of the two linearly independent constant spinor fields of the Minkowski spacetime are constant on $\mathcal{S}$ too, the solutions of $\Pi_c^b \nabla_b \lambda_A = 0$ are precisely these restrictions. Thus if O^A is constant on $\mathcal{S}$, then $O^A \bar{O}^{A'}$ determines a unique constant null *spacetime* vector field (the ‘null wave vector’), and hence a foliation of $\mathcal{S}$ by the level sets of the function $u : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ for which $\Pi_a^b O_B \bar{O}_{B'} = \delta_a u$. By the convexity of $\mathcal{S}$ the vector field $z^a = \Pi_a^b O^B \bar{O}^{B'}$ is vanishing precisely at two points, p_- and p_+ . Thus the function u is strictly monotonically increasing along its integral curves from u_- to u_+ . (Since z^a is vanishing at $p_\pm$, actually these integral curves never reach the points $p_\pm$. Using the coordinate freedom $\zeta = \zeta' + A(u)$, where $A(u)$ is an arbitrary complex valued function, the origin of the complex coordinates $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ in S_u can be shifted to a point of the boundary $\partial S_u = \mathcal{S} \cap S_u$. In particular, for appropriately chosen $A(u)$ the one-parameter family of the origins of the coordinates $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, i.e. in the coordinate system $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ the curve $u \mapsto (u, 0, 0)$, can be chosen to be an integral curve of z^a .) Again by the convexity of $\mathcal{S}$ the boundaries $\partial S_u = \mathcal{S} \cap S_u$ are closed smooth curves, denoted by γ_u , which are the integral curves of the vector field $s^a = \varepsilon^{ab} O_B \bar{O}_{B'}$. However, instead of the natural arch length parameter s of the integral curves γ_u it seems more convenient to use the parameter $w \in [0, 2\pi)$ defined by $w \text{Length}(\gamma_u) := 2\pi s$, measured in each S_u from the intersection point of S_u and an integral curve of z^a , e.g. from the origin of the complex coordinates $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$. Thus (u, w) is a coordinate system on $\mathcal{S} - \{p_-, p_+\} \approx (u_-, u_+) \times S^1$, and the coordinate lines $u = \text{const}$, i.e. the curves γ_u , can be specified in the complex coordinates as $S^1 \rightarrow S_u : w \mapsto (z_u(w), \bar{z}_u(w))$.

Next consider the restriction of the functions ϕ to $\mathcal{S}$. If $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is the restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ of the type N solution ϕ of the linear z.r.m. equation with the constant wave co-vector $O_A \bar{O}_{A'} = \nabla_a u$, then this is not an arbitrary, general smooth complex valued function on $\mathcal{S}$. Indeed, on $\gamma_u = \mathcal{S} \cap S_u$ it is the restriction from S_u to γ_u of a function which is *anti-holomorphic* on S_u . Hence we should characterize these special complex

valued functions on $\mathcal{S}$. We show that the real and the imaginary parts of such a φ are not quite independent. Thus let $F := \text{Re } \phi$, the real part of ϕ . This is harmonic w.r.t. the flat metric Laplace operator on the Riemann surfaces S_u (and hence, in particular, F is real analytic). Therefore, it is completely determined by its restriction $f := F|_{\mathcal{S}}$ to $\mathcal{S}$ via the Dirichlet problem on each of the leaves S_u . Using the fact that each S_u is connected and simply connected, standard theorems of complex analysis guarantee the existence of a real valued function G on Σ such that G is harmonic and $F + iG$ is anti-holomorphic on each S_u . Thus, in particular, G is real analytic on the Riemann surfaces S_u . This G is uniquely determined by F up to an additive constant on each S_u , i.e. G is unique up to addition of a function of u only. Thus the free, unconstrained part of the boundary value φ is e.g. the real part $f = \text{Re } \varphi = \text{Re } \phi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ and the value of its imaginary part $g := \text{Im } \varphi = \text{Im } \phi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ on the integral curve of z^a representing the origin of the complex coordinates. Therefore, in the coordinates (u, w) above, the unconstrained part of φ is equivalent to the pair $(f(u, w), g(u, 0))$ of real functions. (Another, obviously equivalent, representation of the same φ is given by the imaginary part of φ and the value of its real part on the ‘origin curve’.) Finally, by Cauchy’s integral formula the field ϕ at the point $(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ of $\text{int } D(\Sigma)$ can be recovered as

$$\phi(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \phi(u, \zeta) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{f(u, w) + ig(u, w)}{z_u(w) - \zeta} \dot{z}_u(w) dw, \quad (5.1.1)$$

where the complex contour is $\gamma_u : S^1 \rightarrow S_u : w \mapsto (z_u(w), \bar{z}_u(w))$, as above, and the dot denotes derivative with respect to the parameter w . For plane waves f is independent of w , and hence the right hand side of (5.1.1) reduces to $f(u) + ig(u)$. For linear z.r.m. fields with spin zero, for which the pp -waves are always plane waves, this is always the case.

If Σ is flat then the linear z.r.m. field equations take a simple, coupled system of linear equations for the various components of the spinor field. Penrose gave both algebraically general and special solutions to them in terms of complex contour integrals of appropriately chosen meromorphic functions [20], which contour integrals could be reformulated in the projective twistor space [21,17,22]. These contour integrals are similar to (5.1.1), but the contour here is in the spacetime. For special meromorphic functions the solutions of the linear z.r.m. field equations are called elementary states [21,17,22]. These are special solutions that are singular on the light cone of a point of the (compactified) Minkowski spacetime. The significance of these elementary states is that they form a dense subset in the space of all fields [17,23]. This raises the question as whether the pp -wave solutions play similar role in the space of all fields.

5.2 The density of the pp -wave modes in Γ_s

Because of the rather special nature of the pp -waves the significance of the previous investigations and the results may appear at first sight to be quite limited. If Σ were a complete flat Euclidean 3-space, then the solutions $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ of the linear z.r.m. field equations that have finite L_2 -norm (and hence bounded on the whole Σ) could be expanded as a Fourier integral of plane wave modes. The restriction of $\phi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ to a compact piece of Σ would, of course, be a solution there. However, quasi-locally there are much more solutions of the field equations: For example, the pp -wave solutions which are *not* plane waves are not bounded on an infinite Σ . Similarly, if Σ were closed (i.e. compact with no boundary, e.g. a flat torus $\Sigma \approx S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1$), then any solution on Σ would be periodic in the spatial directions, and could be expanded as a Fourier series of plane wave solutions. Thus, again, the space of solutions in the closed case is definitely ‘smaller’ than in the quasi-local case. On the other hand, as we mentioned at the end of the previous subsection, the elementary states do form a dense subset in the space of all fields, and, in particular, in the space of solutions of the linear z.r.m. field equations. Moreover, quasi-locally there are much more ‘elementary’ solutions, the pp -waves, that could be used as a basis to expand the elements of the much larger solution space. Therefore, the question arises naturally as whether or not the plane wave (or at least the pp -wave) solutions span the

space of solutions in the quasi-local case too. The main goal of the present subsection is to show that every spinor field on Σ can be uniformly approximated with arbitrary accuracy in an appropriate way by pp -wave solutions. The precise statement is the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2.1:

Let O^A be a fixed constant spinor field. Then for any continuous totally symmetric spinor field $\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$, $s > 0$, on Σ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist finitely many pp -wave solutions $\phi^i O_A$, $\chi^i O_A$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, of the Weyl equation and totally symmetric constant spinor fields $C_{i A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ such that

$$|\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}(p) - \sum_{i=1}^N \phi^i(p) \chi^i(p) C_{i A_1 \dots A_{2s}}| < \varepsilon$$

at each point $p \in \Sigma$. Here $|\cdot|$ is the pointwise Hermitian norm defined by $|\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}|^2 := 2^s \psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}} \bar{\psi}_{A'_1 \dots A'_{2s}} t^{A_1 A'_1} \dots t^{A_{2s} A'_{2s}}$.

Proof:

Let us fix a globally defined spin frame $\{\mathcal{E}_{\underline{A}}^A\}$, $\underline{A} = 0, 1$, on Σ , and denote the components of any spinor field $\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ in this basis by $\psi_{\underline{A}_1 \dots \underline{A}_{2s}}$, or simply by ψ . Thus ψ is a typical component of the spinor field, which is a continuous complex valued function for continuous $\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$. The logic of our proof follows that of the proof of the Stone–Weierstrass theorem for real functions given in [24] and certain points of the proof for complex functions given in [25]. (We quote the Stone–Weierstrass theorem in the real case in the Appendix from [24].)

Let $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ be the globally defined coordinate system on Σ determined by O^A , and let $\Phi(O^A)$ denote the set of complex valued functions $\phi = \phi(u, \zeta)$ that are smooth in their u variable and complex analytic in their ζ variable. If $c_{m_1 \dots m_k} \in \mathbf{C}$, $m_j = 0, \dots, M_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$ and

$$P(z^1, \dots, z^k) := \sum_{m_1=0}^{M_1} \dots \sum_{m_k=0}^{M_k} c_{m_1 \dots m_k} (z^1)^{m_1} \dots (z^k)^{m_k},$$

a k complex variable polynomial, then for any $\phi^1, \dots, \phi^k \in \Phi(O^A)$ the function $P(u, \zeta) := P(\phi^1(u, \zeta), \dots, \phi^k(u, \zeta))$ is smooth in u and complex analytic in ζ . Thus $\Phi(O^A)$ is an algebra with respect to the usual vector space operations and the pointwise multiplication, and clearly it is unital. Furthermore, $\Phi(O^A)$ separates points of Σ in the sense that for any two different points $p, q \in \Sigma$ there exists a function ϕ in $\Phi(O^A)$ such that $\phi(p) \neq \phi(q)$. In fact, if p and q are in the same Riemann surface S_u , then e.g. $\phi = \zeta$, while if $u(p) \neq u(q)$ then any strictly monotonic real function $\phi = \phi(u)$ separates them.

Let $\Pi(O^A)$ denote the set of the complex valued functions of the form $\pi(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) := \phi^1(u, \zeta) \bar{\chi}^1(u, \bar{\zeta}) + \dots + \phi^n(u, \zeta) \bar{\chi}^n(u, \bar{\zeta})$ on Σ , where $\phi^i, \chi^i \in \Phi(O^A)$. Obviously, the functions π are continuous. Clearly, $\Pi(O^A)$ is the unital $*$ -algebra generated by $\Phi(O^A)$, where the $*$ -operation is the complex conjugation: The pointwise multiplication and the linear combination of any two functions π_1 and π_2 from $\Pi(O^A)$ by complex numbers belong to $\Pi(O^A)$, and if $\pi \in \Pi(O^A)$ then its complex conjugate $\bar{\pi}$ also belongs to $\Pi(O^A)$. $\Phi(O^A)$ is a complex subalgebra in $\Pi(O^A)$.

Finally, let $\bar{\Pi}(O^A)$ denote the uniform closure of $\Pi(O^A)$, i.e. let $\bar{\Pi}(O^A)$ be the set of those functions $\rho : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a function $\pi \in \Pi(O^A)$ for which $|\rho(p) - \pi(p)| < \varepsilon \forall p \in \Sigma$. (For functions or complex numbers $|\cdot|$ means, of course, absolute value.) Our claim is to show that $\bar{\Pi}(O^A)$ is the space $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C})$ of the continuous complex functions on Σ . To prove this, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2.2:

- i. Any function $\rho \in \bar{\Pi}(O^A)$ is continuous;

- ii. $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is closed with respect to the uniform closure;
- iii. $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is a unital $*$ -algebra.

Proof of Lemma 5.2.2:

- i. If $\rho \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ $\exists \pi \in \Pi(O^A)$ such that $|\rho(p) - \pi(p)| < \varepsilon$ for any $p \in \Sigma$. Since π is continuous, p has an open neighbourhood $U_p \subset \Sigma$ such that $|\pi(p) - \pi(q)| < \varepsilon$ for any $q \in U_p$. Then, however, $|\rho(p) - \rho(q)| = |\rho(p) - \pi(p) + \pi(p) - \pi(q) + \pi(q) - \rho(q)| \leq |\rho(p) - \pi(p)| + |\pi(p) - \pi(q)| + |\pi(q) - \rho(q)| < 3\varepsilon$, i.e. ρ is continuous.
- ii. If $\psi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is a function such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a function $\rho \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ satisfying $|\psi(p) - \rho(p)| < \varepsilon \forall p \in \Sigma$, then by the definition of $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ there exists a function $\pi \in \Pi(O^A)$ satisfying $|\pi(p) - \rho(p)| < \varepsilon \forall p \in \Sigma$. Therefore, $|\psi(p) - \pi(p)| = |\psi(p) - \rho(p) + \rho(p) - \pi(p)| \leq |\psi(p) - \rho(p)| + |\rho(p) - \pi(p)| < 2\varepsilon$, i.e. $\psi \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$.
- iii. Let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ and $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi(O^A)$ the corresponding functions approximating them better than $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $|\bar{\rho}_1(p) - \bar{\pi}_1(p)| = |\rho_1(p) - \pi_1(p)| < \varepsilon \forall p \in \Sigma$, i.e. $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is closed with respect to complex conjugation: $\rho_1 \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ implies $\bar{\rho}_1 \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$. If $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbf{C}$, then $|(c_1\rho_1 + c_2\rho_2)(p) - (c_1\pi_1 + c_2\pi_2)(p)| \leq (|c_1| + |c_2|)\varepsilon$, i.e. $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is a complex vector space. Finally, $|(\rho_1\rho_2)(p) - (\pi_1\pi_2)(p)| = |\rho_1(p)(\rho_2(p) - \pi_2(p)) + (\rho_1(p) - \pi_1(p))\pi_2(p)| \leq (\sup_{p \in \Sigma} |\rho_1(p)| + \sup_{p \in \Sigma} |\pi_2(p)|)\varepsilon$, i.e. $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is an algebra. Since the constant functions belong to $\Phi(O^A) \subset \Pi(O^A) \subset \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$, $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is unital. $\square$

Continuation of the proof of Theorem 5.2.1:

By the first statement of Lemma 5.2.2 $\overline{\Pi}(O^A) \subset C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C})$, and by the third statement $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ has the structure $\overline{\Pi}(O^A) = \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A) + i\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$, where $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A) := \{\rho \in \overline{\Pi}(O^A) | \bar{\rho} = \rho\}$, the set of the real elements of $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$. $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ is a real, unital subalgebra, it is closed with respect to the uniform closure, and by the first statement of Lemma 5.2.2 $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A) \subset C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{R})$. We show that $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{R}) \subset \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ holds as well, and hence that $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C}) = \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$. The rest of the proof is essentially that given in [24], but for the sake of completeness we briefly repeat it here. This is based on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.2.3:

- i. For any two different points p and q of Σ and real numbers α and β there exists a function $\rho \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ such that $\rho(p) = \alpha$ and $\rho(q) = \beta$;
- ii. If $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$, then the upper and lower enveloping functions of $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k\}$, defined pointwise by $\rho_1 \cup \dots \cup \rho_k(p) := \max\{\rho_1(p), \dots, \rho_k(p)\}$ and $\rho_1 \cap \dots \cap \rho_k(p) := \min\{\rho_1(p), \dots, \rho_k(p)\}$, respectively, are elements of $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2.3:

- i. Since $\Phi(O^A)$ separates points of Σ , there exists a function $\phi \in \Phi(O^A) \subset \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ such that $\phi(p) \neq \phi(q)$, and hence $\text{Re } \phi(p) \neq \text{Re } \phi(q)$ or $\text{Im } \phi(p) \neq \text{Im } \phi(q)$. Since $\overline{\Pi}(O^A)$ is a $*$ -algebra and $\text{Re } \phi = \frac{1}{2}(\phi + \bar{\phi})$ and $\text{Im } \phi = \frac{1}{2i}(\phi - \bar{\phi})$, both $\text{Re } \phi$ and $\text{Im } \phi$ belong to $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$. Let σ denote either $\text{Re } \phi$ or $\text{Im } \phi$ for which $\sigma(p) \neq \sigma(q)$. Since $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ is unital, the function $\rho(s) := ((\sigma(s) - \sigma(q))\alpha + (\sigma(p) - \sigma(s))\beta) / (\sigma(p) - \sigma(q))$, $s \in \Sigma$, belongs to $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ and has the desired properties.
- ii. It is enough to show the statement for $k = 2$, whenever $\rho_1 \cup \rho_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1 + \rho_2 + |\rho_1 - \rho_2|)$ and $\rho_1 \cap \rho_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1 + \rho_2 - |\rho_1 - \rho_2|)$. Thus it is enough to show that $|\rho| \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ for any $\rho \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$. For, let $M := \sup_{p \in \Sigma} |\rho(p)|$, which is finite. Then by the classical Weierstrass theorem (see Appendix) the real function $y \mapsto |y|$ on $[-M, M]$ can be approximated uniformly by a polynomial $P(y)$ with accuracy ε , and hence with $y = \rho(p)$ one has $|P \circ \rho(p) - |\rho(p)|| = |P(y) - |y|| < \varepsilon$. Thus $|\rho|$ can be approximated uniformly on Σ by the polynomial $P \circ \rho$ of ρ , which belongs to $\overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$. Therefore, $|\rho| \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$. $\square$

Lemma 5.2.4:

Let $f : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be any continuous function and $\mathcal{F}$ a set of continuous functions $F : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that for any $p \in \Sigma$ there is a function $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $F(p) > f(p)$. Then there are finitely many functions $F_1, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_k(p) > f(p)$ for all $p \in \Sigma$. Similarly, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a set of functions such that for any $p \in \Sigma$ $\exists G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $G(p) < f(p)$, then $\exists G_1, \dots, G_l \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $G_1 \cap \dots \cap G_l(p) < f(p)$ for all $p \in \Sigma$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2.4:

Let $p \in \Sigma$ and $F_p \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F_p(p) > f(p)$. Since both f and F_p are continuous, p has an open neighbourhood $U_p \subset \Sigma$ such that $F_p(q) > f(q)$ for all $q \in U_p$. But these neighbourhoods form an open covering $\{U_p | p \in \Sigma\}$ of the compact Σ , thus there are finitely many points $p_1, \dots, p_k$ such that $\{U_{p_1}, \dots, U_{p_k}\}$ already covers Σ . Then, however, $F_{p_i}(q) > f(q) \forall q \in U_{p_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, implies $F_{p_1} \cup \dots \cup F_{p_k}(q) > f(q)$ for all $q \in \Sigma$. The proof of the second part of this lemma is similar. $\square$

Continuation of the proof of Theorem 5.2.1:

Returning to the proof of $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{R}) \subset \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$, let $f : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be any continuous function and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by the first statement of Lemma 5.2.3 for any two points $p, q \in \Sigma$ there exists a function $\rho_{pq} \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ such that

$$\rho_{pq}(p) > f(p) - \varepsilon, \quad (a)$$

$$\rho_{pq}(q) < f(q) + \varepsilon. \quad (b)$$

Now fix q and consider $\mathcal{F}_q := \{\rho_{pq} | p \in \Sigma\}$. Then the function $f - \varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{F}_q$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.2.4, and hence for some finitely many points $p_1, \dots, p_k$ and the corresponding functions $\rho_{p_1 q}, \dots, \rho_{p_k q} \in \mathcal{F}_q$ one has

$$\rho_q(p) := \rho_{p_1 q} \cup \dots \cup \rho_{p_k q}(p) > f(p) - \varepsilon \quad \forall p \in \Sigma. \quad (c)$$

Then by the second statement of Lemma 5.2.3 $\rho_q \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$, and by inequality (b)

$$\rho_q(q) = \max\{\rho_{p_1 q}(q), \dots, \rho_{p_k q}(q)\} < f(q) + \varepsilon. \quad (d)$$

Let $\mathcal{G} := \{\rho_q | q \in \Sigma\}$. Then the function $f + \varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{G}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.2.4 for the lower enveloping case, i.e. for any $p \in \Sigma$ there exists a function $\rho_p \in \mathcal{G}$ such $\rho_p(p) < f(p) + \varepsilon$, and hence there exist functions $\rho_{p_1}, \dots, \rho_{p_l} \in \mathcal{G}$ such that

$$\rho(p) := \rho_{p_1} \cap \dots \cap \rho_{p_l}(p) < f(p) + \varepsilon \quad \forall p \in \Sigma.$$

By the second statement of Lemma 5.2.3 $\rho \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$ and, by inequality (c), ρ satisfies

$$\rho(p) = \min\{\rho_{p_1}(p), \dots, \rho_{p_l}(p)\} > f(p) - \varepsilon \quad \forall p \in \Sigma.$$

Thus, to summarize the last two inequalities, we obtain $|f(p) - \rho(p)| < \varepsilon$ for all $p \in \Sigma$, and hence $f \in \overline{\Pi}_{re}(O^A)$. Therefore, $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C}) = \overline{\Pi}(O^A)$.

Thus we have proven that for any $\psi \in C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C})$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist functions $\phi^1, \dots, \phi^n, \chi^1, \dots, \chi^n \in \Phi(O^A)$ such that $|\psi(p) - (\phi^1(p)\bar{\chi}^1(p) + \dots + \phi^n(p)\bar{\chi}^n(p))| < \varepsilon$ for all $p \in \Sigma$, i.e. each component $\psi_{\underline{A}_1 \dots \underline{A}_{2s}}$ of a continuous spinor field $\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ can be approximated uniformly on Σ by a function of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n \phi^i \bar{\chi}^i$ with arbitrary accuracy. But $\psi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ has only finite number of components, thus there is a collection of functions $\phi^i, \chi^i \in \Phi(O^A)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and constants $C_{i \underline{A}_1 \dots \underline{A}_{2s}}$ (with value 0 or 1 depending on the indices i and $\underline{A}_1, \dots, \underline{A}_{2s}$) such that for any set of spinor name indices $\underline{A}_1, \dots, \underline{A}_{2s}$

$$|\psi_{\underline{A}_1 \dots \underline{A}_{2s}}(p) - \sum_{i=1}^N \phi^i(p) \bar{\chi}^i(p) C_{i \underline{A}_1 \dots \underline{A}_{2s}}| < \varepsilon \quad \forall p \in \Sigma. \quad (e)$$

Let the spinor basis $\{\mathcal{E}_A^A\}$ be chosen to be constant on Σ , whenever $C_{iA_1\dots A_{2s}} := C_{iA_1\dots A_{2s}} \mathcal{E}_{A_1}^A \dots \mathcal{E}_{A_{2s}}^A$ are constant spinor fields. Then inequality (e) is almost the statement of Theorem 5.2.1 to be proven. The only difference between them is that $|\cdot|$ has different meaning in Theorem 5.2.1 and in inequality (e): In the former it is the pointwise Hermitian norm defined with respect to the normal t^a of Σ , while in (e) it is the absolute value of the components of the spinor fields in a given spinor basis $\{\mathcal{E}_A^A\}$. However, since the two norms are equivalent at each point $p \in \Sigma$ and Σ is compact, the two norms are equivalent on Σ too. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.2.1. $\square$

Though at first sight this theorem is simply the Stone–Weierstrass theorem applied to spinor fields, it is slightly more than this. It tells us that the pp -wave solutions e.g. of the Weyl equation, even with a given single common constant wave spinor O^A , provide a family $\Phi(O^A)$ of functions which is rich enough to be able to approximate uniformly any spinor field by spinor fields of the structure $\pi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \phi^i \bar{\chi}^i C_{iA_1\dots A_{2s}}$. Here the combination $\phi^1 \bar{\chi}^1 + \dots + \phi^n \bar{\chi}^n$ is an element of $\Phi(O^A) \otimes \bar{\Phi}(O^A)$, the tensor product of $\Phi(O^A)$ and its complex conjugate. However, $\bar{\chi}(u, \bar{\zeta})$ can also be interpreted as the profile function in the pp -wave solution of the *complex conjugate* Weyl equation $\nabla_A{}^{A'} \sigma_{A'} = 0$. Its constant wave spinor is just the complex conjugate of O^A , and hence its wave vector is still that of the solution $\phi(u, \zeta) O^A$. Obviously, the two helicities of these solutions are just the opposite of each other. Therefore, the expansion that Theorem 5.2.1 provides is based on the pp -wave solutions both of the Weyl and the complex conjugate Weyl equations with a given constant, common wave vector. Clearly, $\Phi(O^A)$ in itself with a single, fixed constant spinor field O^A is *not* dense in $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C})$, it is only the space $\Phi(O^A) \otimes \bar{\Phi}(O^A)$ of the homogeneous Hermitian quadratic expressions of the functions ϕ that is dense.

Clearly, it is irrelevant which z.r.m. field equation (for strictly non-zero spin) is used to define the pp -waves: The structure of the pp -waves for any non-zero spin is similar. On the other hand, the pp -wave solutions of the *scalar* wave equation are plane waves, which for one given wave vector L^a do *not* provide a big enough set $\Phi(L^a)$. Thus if we wanted to use only plane waves as a basis of approximation, then, by the Stone–Weierstrass theorem (see Appendix), we would have to take plane waves with *three independent* wave vectors L_1^a , L_2^a and L_3^a , and it would be $\Phi(L_1^a) \otimes \Phi(L_2^a) \otimes \Phi(L_3^a)$ whose density in $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C})$ could be proven. The standard plane wave expansions in physics are such, and, as a consequence, the approximation is made by a *cubic* (rather than a quadratic) expression of the plane waves. The advantage of the approximation based on the pp -waves (rather than only plane waves) is that we should use solutions with *only one constant spinor field* O^A and its complex conjugate $\bar{O}^{A'}$. Although $\Phi(O^A)$ with fixed O^A is not dense in $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{C})$, the set of the pp -waves with *all the constant spinor fields* can be proven to be dense. Note that the approximation based on the genuine pp -waves is possible only quasi-locally: Both in the asymptotically flat and the closed cases, discussed at the beginning of this subsections, the pp -waves reduce to plane waves.

As is well known, uniform convergence in a space of continuous functions can be characterized by convergence with respect to the L_∞ (or supremum) norm. Since by Theorem 5.2.1 the space $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1\dots A_{2s})})$ of the continuous, totally symmetric spinor fields on Σ is closed with respect to the uniform closure, it is complete with respect to the norm $\|\psi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}\|_\infty := \sup_{p \in \Sigma} |\psi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}(p)|$, where $|\cdot|$ is the pointwise Hermitian norm used in Theorem 5.2.1. However, by the compactness of Σ , $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{S}_{(A_1\dots A_{2s})}) \subset \Gamma_s$ is a subspace and, as a simple consequence of the definitions, $\|\psi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}\| \leq \sqrt{\text{Vol}(\Sigma)} \|\psi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}\|_\infty$ holds, where $\text{Vol}(\Sigma)$ is the metric volume of Σ . Consequently, Theorem 5.2.1 implies that any square-integrable totally symmetric spinor field can also be approximated by the spinor fields $\pi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}$ above with arbitrary accuracy in the L_2 norm. Or, in other words, *the spinor fields $\pi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}$ built from the pp -wave solutions of the Weyl and the complex conjugate Weyl equations even with fixed constant spinor field O^A form a dense subspace in Γ_s .*

The spinor field $\psi_{A_1\dots A_{2s}}$ in Theorem 5.2.1 is not required to satisfy any field equation. If, for example, it is a solution of the linear constraint equation (4.1.2), then Theorem 5.2.1 implies that the spinor fields of

the form $\pi_{A_1 \dots A_{2s}}$ above form a dense subspace in the ‘constraint surface’ $\hat{\Gamma}_s \subset \Gamma_s$. An even more interesting case is when ϕ_{AB}^α is the spinor form of the Yang–Mills field strength with a non-Abelian gauge group, and hence satisfies a *nonlinear* spinor field equation on Σ . Then the set of the solutions is a subset of $\Gamma_1 \times \dots \times \Gamma_1$ ($\dim \mathcal{G}$ -times), in which the spinor fields π_{AB}^α form a dense subset. Thus the solutions of *nonlinear* field equations on Σ can be uniformly approximated by spinor fields built from the *pp*-wave solutions of *linear* equations.

The fact that the algebra $\Phi(O^A)$ is not only a class of functions that separates points of Σ but it is essentially the set of the *pp*-wave *solutions* is crucial from the point of view of holography. We saw in subsection 5.1 that each *pp*-wave solution can be characterized completely by the holographic data on $\mathcal{S} = \partial\Sigma$. Since by Theorem 5.2.1 every solution of the field equations can be approximated by finitely many *pp*-waves with arbitrary accuracy, it follows that every solution can also be approximated by the holographic data for finitely many *pp*-waves as well. Hence the ‘screen map’ $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ of the Introduction is replaced by $\Phi(O^A) \rightarrow$ ‘the set of the holographic data on $\mathcal{S}$ ’, providing a rather non-local representation of the fields on Σ in terms of fields on $\mathcal{S}$. Thus $\Phi(O^A)$ is similar to a spider’s web, where the space Σ is ‘scanned’ by the *pp*-waves and the information gained is encoded into the holographic data on $\mathcal{S}$. Finally, if we fix a foliation $\{\Sigma_t\}$ of $D(\Sigma)$ by smooth spacelike hypersurfaces, then by mapping the fields induced on each of the leaves Σ_t from $D(\Sigma)$ to the corresponding holographic data on $\mathcal{S}$, we can represent every continuous spinor field on $D(\Sigma)$ by a 1-parameter family of holographic data. Therefore, quasi-local holography for the classical fields considered here works in Minkowski spacetime.

Appendix: The Stone–Weierstrass theorem

The form of the Stone–Weierstrass theorem that motivated Theorem 5.2.1, quoted from [23], is

Theorem: Let X be a compact Hausdorff space and $f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be continuous. If Φ is a set of continuous functions $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that Φ separates the points of X (in the sense that for any two different points $p, q \in X$ there exists a function $\phi \in \Phi$ such that $\phi(p) \neq \phi(q)$), then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist finitely many functions $\phi^1, \dots, \phi^k \in \Phi$ and a real polynomial $P = P(x^1, \dots, x^k)$ with k variables such that $|f(p) - P(\phi^1(p), \dots, \phi^k(p))| < \varepsilon$ for all $p \in X$.

Thus the role of Φ is to provide a ‘coordinate system’ on the space of continuous real functions on X , and if it is ‘rich enough’ then the elements of the unital algebra generated by Φ is uniformly dense in the space $C^0(X, \mathbf{R})$ of the continuous real functions endowed with the supremum norm.

The classical Weierstrass approximation theorem that we used in the proof of Theorem 5.2.1 is its simple consequence: If $f : [a, b] \subset \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a polynomial P such that $|f(x) - P(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in [a, b]$.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Jörg Frauendiener for the exhaustive discussion on the solutions of the linear z.r.m. field equations and their twistor theoretical aspects, and to Zoltán Perjés for his remarks on the elementary states. This work was partially supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund grant OTKA T042531.

References

- [1] G. ’t Hooft, Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity, gr-qc/9310026
- [2] J.D. Bekenstein, A universal upper bound on the entropy to energy ratio for bounded systems, Phys. Rev. D **23** 287–298 (1981)

- [3] R. Bousso, A covariant entropy conjecture, JHEP 07 (1999) 004, hep-th/9905177v3
- [4] L. Susskind, The world as a hologram, J. Math. Phys. **36** 6377–6396 (1995), hep-th/9409089
- [5] S. Corley, T. Jacobson, Focusing and the holographic hypothesis, Phys. Rev. D **53** R6720–R6724 (1996), gr-qc/9602043
- [6] R. Bousso, The holographic principle, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74** 825–874 (2002), hep-th/0203101v1
- [7] L.B. Szabados, Quasi-local energy-momentum and angular momentum in GR: A review article, Living Rev. Relativity **7** (2004) 4. [Online article]: <http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2004-4>
- [8] A.J. Dougan, L.J. Mason, Quasilocal mass constructions with positive energy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** 2119–2122 (1991)
- [9] L.B. Szabados, On the positivity of the quasi-local mass, Class. Quantum Grav. **10** 1899–1905 (1993)
- [10] L.B. Szabados, Two dimensional Sen connections and quasi-local energy-momentum, Class. Quantum Grav. **11** 1847–1866 (1994), gr-qc/9402005
- [11] L.B. Szabados, Quasi-local energy-momentum and two-surface characterization of the pp -wave spacetimes, Class. Quantum Grav. **13** 1661–1678 (1996), gr-qc/9512013
- [12] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space-time*, Vol 1, Two-Spinor Calculus and Relativistic Fields, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1984
- [13] K.P. Tod, The Stützfunktion and the cut function, in *Recent Advances in General Relativity: Essays in honor of Ezra Newman*, Vol 4 of Einstein studies, pp. 182–195, Eds.: A.I. Janis and J.R. Porter, Birkhäuser, Boston 1992
- [14] S. Coleman, Non-Abelian plane waves, Phys. Lett. **70B** 59–60 (1977)
- [15] R. Güven, Solution for gravity coupled to non-Abelian plane waves, Phys. Rev. D **19** 471–472 (1979)
- [16] J. Frauendiener, G.A.J. Sparling, On a class of consistent linear higher spin equations on curved manifolds, J. Geom. Phys. **30** 54–101 (1999)
- [17] S.A. Hugget, K.P. Tod, *An Introduction to Twistor Theory*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts No 4, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1985
- [18] A. Sen, On the existence of neutrino ‘zero-modes’ in vacuum spacetimes, J. Math. Phys. **22** 1781–1786 (1981)
- [19] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity*, Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago 1984
- [20] R. Penrose, Solutions of the zero-rest-mass equations, J. Math. Phys. **10** 38–39 (1969)
- [21] R. Penrose, M.A.H. MacCallum, Twistor theory: An approach to the quantisation of fields and space-time, Phys. Rep. **6** 241–316 (1972)
- [22] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space-time*, Vol 2, Spinor and Twistor Methods in Space-time Geometry, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1986
- [23] M.G. Eastwood, A.M. Pilato, On the density of twistor elementary states, Pacific J. Math. **151** 201–215 (1991)
- [24] B. Sz.-Nagy, *Introduction to Real Functions and Orthogonal Expansion*, Joint edition published by Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest and Oxford University Press, New York 1964
- [25] G.K. Pedersen, *Analysis Now*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics Vol 118, Springer–Verlag, New York 1989